



COLUMBANUS, N^o. VI.

OR, AN

Unpublished Correspondence

BETWEEN

The Rt. Rev. Dr. POYNTER and the Rev. Dr. O'CONOR,

ON FOREIGN-INFLUENCING MAXIMS,

WITH

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

CANONICAL & LEGAL SECURITIES

AGAINST SUCH MAXIMS.

By the Rev. C. O'CONOR, D. D.

¹⁴ Whoever issues Censures, without authorities to support them, does not publish what deserves the name of Censures, but what ought to be considered as *Ribaldry*. We fear not those who charge us with *heresy or schism*, whilst the faith of all ages is with us. But we *much* fear for those, who think they may with impunity violate Christian Charity, and Ecclesiastical Unity, by their wanton Censures."

Bossuet Defensio Cleri Gal. Dissert. Prel. c. 94.

" Dieu fera tourner a notre profit, la connoissance des desordres qu' il a soufferts dans l' Eglise. Si ces desordres avoient tellement cessé qu' il n'en restat plus des vestiges, peut-etre pourroit on les laisser dans un eternel oubli. Mais nous n en voyons *que trop* les suites funestes." *Fleuri*, Disc. 4, n. xiii.

PRINTED BY J. SEELEY, BUCKINGHAM;

FOR PAYNE, PALL MALL; EGERTON, CHARING CROSS;
AND BOOKER, BOND STREET, LONDON.

1813.

[Price, 6s.]

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

THE BOARD OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

AND RESOLVED, That the sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the purpose of purchasing the site for a new building for the College of the City of New York.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
OBJECT of the following Sheets. Dangerous Doctrines.	v
Correspondence with Dr. Poynter, from Originals. Doctrines enforced by Censures which require Legal restraint. Dr. Poynter's Letter of June 9	xiii
Subsequent Correspondence historically detailed	xxi
Dr. Poynter's Letter from the Secret Synod of Durham, with Observations on <i>secret</i> Synods.—Compare pages 66 and 76	xxi
Subsequent Correspondence down to November 11. Dr. Poynter's Letter of Suspension, dated November 17, 1812, with Remarks	xxiv
Query, whether Dr. Poynter is really Vicar Apostolic of the London District. Compare page xxvii.	
Columbanus's Case stated fairly	1
Dangerous Maxims maintained by Irish Bishops and Vicars Apostolic. Securities to be insisted on against Political Censures and new Tests. Compare page 130.,	5
Columbanus falsely accused of Schism	17
Episcopal claim to <i>exclusive</i> jurisdiction <i>jure Divino</i> examined, and proved to be <i>a new Article and Test of faith</i> , fabricated by the present Vicars Apostolic. Compare page 81	21
Essential difference between Priests and Bishops fairly stated	23
Doctrine of the Irish Sedulius. Policy of our modern Irish Bishops	32
True idea of Episcopal Jurisdiction	36

Three opinions on this subject stated, and the real Catholic Doctrine explained. Query, whether Dr. Poynter is really Bishop of the London District	40
Columbanus's Challenge	50
Character of genuine Catholic Religion contrasted with the Conduct and maxims of the Vicars Apostolic	54
Dangerous attempt to enforce the Bull Unigenitus	60
Plan to stultify Ireland by modern Maynooth Education. Popery and Catholicity, how different	61
<i>Secret Synods</i> , how dangerous to the Catholics themselves	75
The Pope's indirect power over temporals	83
Maynooth Barrister Theologues described	97
An Historical Narrative of the reign of James I. applied to our own times	108
Securities to be enacted against such dangerous principles	130
The Portuguese <i>Veto</i> .—Dr. Moylan's <i>Veto</i>	133
The Discipline of Trent how far obligatory on Catholic Ireland	147
Repugnant to our Oath of Allegiance. Narrative of <i>Father Geoghagan</i>	153
Irish Miracles for Foreign Influence	162
Appeal to the Parish Priests of the British Islands. Conclusion	175
Chronology of events referred to by <i>Columbanus</i>	190
Letters from Primate Reily, and from Dr. Troy and Moylan on the <i>Veto</i>	199
Dr. Milner turns informer against Abbe Blanchard	204
Synod of Tullow—with Remarks	205
Appeal of the Connacht Bishops against Dr. Troy	208
Synod of Dublin—with Remarks	210
Why the Bishops declared the <i>Veto</i> only <i>inexpedient</i> in these Synods, and why now they declare it schismatical	212
Dr. Milner's Synod of London, and New Test of Papal infallibility, <i>avowed</i>	218

Object of the following Sheets.

1. **T**HEOLOGICAL malignity has exhausted itself in endeavouring to enthrone a Spiritual Fiend in the heart of *Columbanus*, misrepresenting his doctrines, and maligning his *motives*, because he has dared to combat the abuses of an *undefined* Episcopal authority which places itself *above* the most venerable Laws of the Catholic Church, which never was tolerated by any Catholic State, and which is as disgraceful and dangerous to the Catholics of the British Islands themselves, as it is formidable to the State!

To inquiries into *motives*, in which the public have no concern, *Columbanus* scorns to condescend. The Chronology of events to which he refers, at page 190 of these sheets, abundantly demonstrates that, long before the publication of his first No. the liberties of the Irish Church had been secretly invaded in 1799, by those very persons who ought to have been its guardians! that from the secret intrigue of 1799, the spirit of encroachment stalked abroad with the gigantic stride of a Philistine; and that, in the secret Synods of 1809 and 1810, the domineering maxims of an *Algerine* form of Church Government were unblushingly avowed!

revokable at pleasure, whilst Bishops and Parish Priests, holding by divine commission, cannot be deposed but by a Canonical Sentence, founded on conviction after trial, or voluntary resignation. The Pope would thus absorb into his *Plenitude of power*, the whole hierarchy; Apostolical Succession would be confined to him: there would be one *Universal Bishop*, or, as the Vicar of Castabala blushes not to declare him, one *Universal Metropolitan*, and the constitution of the Catholic Church would thus be utterly destroyed!

2. Is it necessary to inquire, with metaphysical malignity, into Columbanus's *motives*, whilst such *facts* as these stand staring us in the face? Can we be at a loss, whilst the Irish Bishops, who *profess* to have abjured the Pope's power *direct* and *indirect* over the temporalities of kings, have accepted and approved, as good and holy, Pope Pius VIIth's Bulls "*Qui Christi vices*" and "*Ecclesia Christi*," in which the maxims of *direct* temporal power, are expressly referred to, and the *properties*, and the *rights*, and *titles* of the French Crown and the French Nobility are, in *virtue of the Pope's plenitude of power*, expressly abrogated and annulled!—

Surely they who thus disinherit the Nobility of France, in *virtue of the Pope's plenitude of power*, betray the secret, that, in similar *rabble* circumstances, they would equally consecrate, in

compliance with a foreign Potentate, a similar proceeding towards the English and Irish Nobility, and George III!—The Acts which the Irish Bishops thus declare *holy* and *valid*, the late Pope Pius VI. declared *null* and *impious*; and the excuse of “*exigency of times*” which they allege for Pius VII. he declares to be infamous *prevarication*! and he adds “It is beyond my competency, to depose innocent Bishops, for it is *repugnant to the laws of the Catholic Church*, “*ut pote qui Canonici Regulis adversaretur.*”

As the first step in vice leads directly to a second so one false maxim once adopted, is assumed as a *principle*, from which other errors inevitably flow. Whilst the Irish Bishops proceeded in this career of Papal flattery, they gloried that “the *recommendations of us Bishops have been progressively advancing in weight and authority with the Holy See,*” * they Resolved also, “that it is the *exclusive right* of R. Catholic “Bishops, to *discuss* all matters appertaining to “the *Doctrines and Discipline of the R. Catholic “Church.*” † Consistently enough with *such* maxims, they named their own Successors; turned their Dioceses into worldly inheritances,

* See the 12th Resolution of the Synod of Dublin of Feb. 26, 1810, prior in date to the first No. of Columbanus.

† 1st Resolution of their Synod of Feb. 28th, 1810.

X OBJECT OF THE FOLLOWING SHEETS.

to be disposed of as they thought proper; abolished the sacred elections of Dean and Chapter; endeavoured to render the memory of such elections odious, assimilating them to the drunken and turbulent elections of Irish Members of Parliament, and casting every odium they could on those who insisted that the Sacred elections of Dean and Chapter, regulated by the *Canons*, are to be numbered with the most ancient and venerable institutions of the Catholic Church.

3. Such was the Ecclesiastical state of Ireland when *Columbanus's* first No. appeared. Whether that work influenced the subsequent conduct of those self-constituting authorities, it would be presumptuous in him to declare. Certain it is, however, that though much *personal abuse* has been lavished upon him, his arguments have not been answered; the profane nomination of Successors by secret influence has been discontinued; the Vicar of Castabala has been silenced; and much obloquy is spared to the Catholic Church, by the utter contempt which that self-refuted Scribbler has brought upon himself!

Some foreign and *dangerous* maxims remain yet to be combated, which it is hoped that the following sheets will completely expose. Dr. Poynter's Letters, and the Remarks I shall occasionally make on them, will open the eyes of the Catholics to the dangers in which they

and their posterity must otherwise be involved, and then the Catholic cause will come forward in all its Majesty, unclouded by foreign mists, unsophisticated by domestic intrigue!

One of the foreign dangerous maxims which yet remains to be combated is, that in no case, in no circumstances, in no exigency of times, however imperious, not even in the present condition of Italy and of Rome, can the Irish Church have a right to perpetuate its own existence by giving institution to its own Bishops, without the consent of the Pope! I utterly deny this position, and I refer to the Braganza Revolution of Portugal—I reject it as hostile to the fundamental principles of Christianity. Every Catholic Church of every nation, in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, possesses, by Divine Institution, an inherent right of self-preservation, which no Pope can extinguish; and, in the present state of Europe and of Ireland, that is a Right which the Irish are now compelled by imperious necessity to enforce, for otherwise Emancipation can never be obtained.—The Pope's power of *nominating* to Irish Bishopricks is but a very recent concession, it was opposed by the Catholic Supreme Council of Kilkenny, in 1648, when it was *usurped* by the Pope's Nuncio, and acquiesced in by those sycophant Bishops, who subscribed to his *private* Synods of Waterford, and submitted

xii OBJECT OF THE FOLLOWING SHEETS.

to his infamous Censures, and *Rebellious*, and *Sacrilegious* excommunications.

With regard to Canonical *Institution*, there is no article of Catholic faith more certain, than that no power is *essential* to the Pope's Primacy, but that only which he derives from our Saviour through St. Peter, first Bishop of Rome; that whatever additional power has, in subsequent ages, been granted to Popes by human concession, may be resumed by the authority which granted it; that throughout a period of 12 Centuries, the *mere Irish* Bishops derived institution from the Chapters of their respective Sees and Provincial Synods; that the Bishops of Hiona derived institution from the Abbot, who was always a simple Priest, and had jurisdiction over the Bishop; and that what has been the Discipline of the Irish Church for 12 Centuries may be the Discipline again.

But let us hear Dr. Poynter from the smoak in which he is enveloped, some flashes of *lightning* may be elicited to illuminate the clouded horizon of British Catholicity, "*ex pemo dare lucem*"—The reasoning and thinking Catholic will now see the danger which Columbanus has forewarned, staring him in the face. and the Laity will recollect that they are to act for themselves.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER I.

Right Rev. Dr. POYNTER to the Rev. Dr. O'CONOR.

(Printed from the Original, with Notes by the Rev. Dr. O'Conor.)

REV. SIR,

AT the time of the death of my much lamented Predecessor, I was engaged in preparing a letter to you *in our joint names*. The object of which was to call for a satisfactory explanation of your doctrine, on some important subjects, that are treated in certain publications, which, within these two or three years, have appeared under your name, and of which we consequently supposed you to be the Author. But now, by the demise of the Right Rev. Dr. Douglass, this duty is left *solely* to me, as Ecclesiastic Superior of the London District. *

Amongst these publications, we particularly noticed a late one, entitled "An Historical Address on the Calamities occa-

* And yet Dr. Poynter writes from Durham, August 25, 1812, that "reasons for withdrawing all Dr. O'Conor's Ecclesiastical powers, and forbidding him to say Mass in the London District, have been assigned in Letters, addressed by Dr. Douglas and myself to him." See page 17* of the following sheets.

sioned by Foreign Influence in the Nomination of Bishops to Irish Sees." Part II. By the Rev. C. O'Connor, D.D. Printed by J. Seeley, Buckingham. 1812. I should be happy to hear from you Sir, that you are not the Author of the said "*Historical Address, &c.*" If you acknowledge yourself to be the Author of the same, I request you to give me satisfaction concerning certain passages in particular, on which I feel it my duty to call for an explanation of your doctrine. *

I. In the proposal you make to the Catholics of Ireland, p. 490-491 of the same *Historical Address*, you propose 2° "that the Chapter of each vacant Diocese, may, as formerly, elect three Candidates, one of whom is *to be confirmed* in a Provincial Synod, convened by the Metropolitan or Senior Bishop, who is to preside."

By *Confirmation*, I presume you understand, Canonical Institution, or the act of conferring Spiritual Jurisdiction on the Bishop Elect, for the spiritual government of his Diocese.

According to the existing general discipline, which has been established and observed for several centuries, at least in the Western part of the Catholic Church, this power of *confirming* Bishops is reserved exclusively to the Apostolic See. In the passage, cited above, you propose to the Catholics of Ireland, a change to be made in the present discipline relative to the Confirmation of Bishops. †

* Here then he confines his censures to the second part of my *Historical Address*. The first part, and the preceding numbers of Columbanus are allowed to pass uncensured. Compare his Letter from Durham.

† To propose such a change is not, and cannot be deemed schismatical, as long as the person who proposes it abides by the established order of things. Now I have declared, that until the Irish Nation comes to a domestic arrangement, I abide by the established order, as long as that subsists—but if, by the state of Europe, that order should be rendered totally ineffectual, so as in *reality to cease*, from the actual impossibility of it, then I assert that the Irish Nation is as competent to give institu-

I request you to inform me, whether you propose that this change should be made *with*, or *without*, the full consent of the Apostolic See previously obtained for that effect. *

To satisfy me concerning your principles on this subject, will you subscribe the following declaration? "Quamvis antiquioribus temporibus, Confirmatio et Consecratio Neo-Electorum Episcoporum ad Provinciales Synodos, præcipuè verò ad Metropolitanum pertinuerit, attamen legitimis de causis hæc disciplina per *universum Occidentem* mutata fuit, neque pristinam hac in parte disciplinam reduci posse existimo, nisi de pleno atque libero Summæ Sedis assensu." †

II. On the subject of the Supremacy of the Pope you write, p. 43, Historical Address, "They (the Popes) knew that the *sum-total* of their Primacy consisted in their power to enforce the execution of the Canons throughout the Universal Church."—In your letter entitled "Columbanus ad Hibernos," p. 87, you write, "The Pope's Supremacy consists in a power of *inspecting* all Orders of the Hierarchy, so as to take care, not that they shall have such Church Discipline as he may *think proper to impose*; not that we shall have Bishops of his *Nomination*: but that the *faith*, which we outwardly profess, shall be conformable with that revelation, which was made by our Saviour, and that our *morals* shall be conformable with our faith.... in this, and in *this only*, consists the Pope's Supremacy by Divine right."—In your letter Columbanus ad Hibernos," N° iv, p. 81, speaking of St.

tion to its Bishops, according to the ancient Canonical Discipline, as Portugal was after the Braganza Revolution. The Pope could not refuse his assent to the King's nomination of Bishops in France.

* If the consent of the Apostolic See can be obtained, good and well; if not, I answer exactly as the Portuguese did.—Every Church has an *inherent right* to perpetuate itself.

† My answer to this Latin Proposition is contained in the preceding note.

Peter and the other Apostles, you say, "He (St. Peter) could "not limit, or modify, or *reserve* to himself any part of that "spiritual power of binding and loosing, which they (the Apostles) all equally received. They were his equals in every "respect, except in a Primacy of general *Inspection*, for the "preservation of unity, of *faith*, and *morals*, but not of discipline, in which all National Churches differ. So, for instance, the Speaker of the House of Commons is the first "Member, but not the *absolute Monarch* of that House. He "enforces its *forms* and *usages*, but he makes none; he preserves *legal* order, but he can introduce no new order."

On this subject, I request you to inform me, whether you admit that the Pope's Supremacy by Divine right includes the power of true *jurisdiction* in matters of *discipline* for the government of the Universal Church? And that by this power of *jurisdiction* he can, not only issue decrees concerning faith, but *make laws of discipline*, which extend to all particular Churches? * Whether you acknowledge, that in virtue of his supreme power in the Church, the Pope can *reserve* some more weighty criminal causes to his own tribunal? †

Will you subscribe the following declaration on this subject? "Assero hunc primatum, qui non ordinis, *inspec-*

* Answer—Even in Italy it is admitted, as Muratori observes, that the Pope's Laws are not obligatory until they are received by the Church. Muratori de Moderamine Ingeniorum. Do Englishmen carry Papal power further than the Italians themselves? Muratori says that the Pope's Laws are not obligatory except in his own States—"nisi posterior accedat Ecclesiæ assensus."

† In virtue of his *Supreme Power*! I know not what Dr. P. means. Does he mean of his Divine or of his human power? If of his *Divine* right of Primacy, I absolutely deny that any such power of reserving cases to himself is essential to his Primacy, and I maintain over and over again, that the Absolving power is, by Divine right, *equal in all Bishops*, but not in Vicars Apostolic, like Dr. Poynter, who have only delegated power, which is revocable at the will of the Pope.

“*tionis ac directionis tantum est, sed et veræ auctoritatis ac jurisdictionis, in Petri Successores, Romanos Pontifices, sedemque Apostolicam, hujus Unitatis centrum et radicem, jure divino transiisse.*”

Let it be observed that *jurisdiction* is something more than *Inspection*. *

III. I grieve to observe, that from certain unfair statements of the discipline of the *Council of Trent*, you have proceeded to speak of the same Council in terms highly disrespectful and scandalous. In stating some of the Canons of that venerable Council, p. 115 of the “*Historical Address*, by which not only Ecclesiastic, but civil punishments are denounced against those that violate them, it is certainly unfair, *considering the inferences you draw from them*, to omit the observation, that there were present in the Council not only Bishops, but Ambassadors from temporal Princes, who concurred, in the names of their respective Sovereigns, with the spiritual power, in suppressing certain crimes, such as that of duelling, which are no less prejudicial to the good of civil society, than contrary to the laws of God and of his Church, and that these denunciations of temporal punishments could not have effect in any particular State, till they are admitted and adopted as a part of the laws of that State. (See Bossuet *Defens. Declar. Cleri. Gal.* part i, lib. 4, c. iv and v.) It is unfair, I say, to omit such observations as might be drawn from the concurrence or concession of the civil power in Catholic Kingdoms, and then to declaim against, what you call the *Politico-Tridentine* disci-

* Answer—Dr. P. well knows that I acknowledge the Pope's Primacy *jure Divino*, and that it is a Primacy of *jurisdiction*, extending to questions of *faith* and *universal discipline*, for the maintenance of *Christian unity* by *Canonical Law*. His object in putting such a question to one who has so often and so publicly avowed this Supremacy, appears to be no other, than to make Catholics fancy that *I am a heretic*, and consequently to prevent my works from being read.

pline of this General Council of the Catholic Church. Must not every Catholic feel that your language concerning the discipline of the Council of Trent, pages 124, 131, 133, 134, is inconsistent with the respect and deference due to the Authority of a General Council? *

From your language concerning the Council of Trent, p. 126 of your Historical Address, I am led to doubt whether you submit *in any sense* to the Authority of that Council, with respect either to its definitions of *doctrine*, or to *any* of its Canons of *discipline*; † and moreover, whether you submit to the Authority of *any* General Council of the Catholic Church, with respect to its definitions of *doctrine*; since the doctrines, that were defined in the Council of Nice in the 4th century, or in the Council of Constantinople in the 7th, were believed and taught in the 2d.

Does Dr. P. mean to confound articles of *Discipline*, with articles of *Doctrine*? If he does, then let him declare at once for the *Vicar of Castabala*, who expressly says that the *Discipline* of Trent is as binding on Irish Catholics as the *Doctrine of seven Sacraments*. If he does not, then I answer, that I receive and venerate the dogmatical decisions of Trent, and *this he perfectly knows*, whilst I decidedly reject the *Discipline*, as it was rejected by the Gallican Church.

For further particulars I refer to my *Historical Address*, part ii, and to the following sheets, p. 147. Sir J. Hippisley, much better acquainted with the principles of the Catholic Religion than the Vicar of Castabala, says—"some writers have contended that the Discipline of the Council of Trent is paramount in Ireland. The fact is, that, in the Archdiocese of *Dublin*, and in the Dioceses of *Meath*, *Kildare*, *Ossory*, *Ferns*, and in the Wardenate of *Galway*, containing a vast mass of Catholic population, the *Discipline of the Council of Trent has never been received*! Substance of his Speech, May 18, 1810.

† Of this very *charitable doubt*, by which Dr. P. insinuates that I do not submit to the authority of *any General Council of the Catholic Church* with respect to its definitions of *Doctrine*, all I will say is, that I make him a *low bow*, that I refer him to the very book which he censures, where my thorough submission to the *defined doctrines* of the Catholic Church is *repeatedly declared*, and that this mode of insinuating heresy against Catholic writers, ill becomes the gravity, or the sanctity of the Episcopal character.

I therefore ask you, whether you pay that respect and obedience to the Council of Trent, which are due to the Authority of a General Council? Whether you *receive* the *doctrines* of faith, defined by that Council, *as proposed to your belief by the Council of Trent*? Whether you receive any of its Canons of discipline?

Will you subscribe this declaration. “*Cætera item omnia a sacris Canonibus et œcumenicis Conciliis, ac præcipuè a Sacro-Sancta Tridentina Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor.*” *

IV. In your late *Historical Address*, p. 23, asking if there are now men that maintain “that the fear of an excommunication, *however unjust*, ought to prevent us from doing our duty?” You add in a Note, “This is the 95th proposition of the *Bull Unigenitus*, which no foreign influenced Bishop dares to condemn.” I may here observe, that by adding the word *however*, you give a sense to the proposition, which it does not bear in Quesnellius, or in the *Bull Unigenitus*.

As you here exclaim that “No foreign influenced Bishop dares to condemn” the *Bull Unigenitus*: I call upon you to inform me, 1°. Whether you condemn the *Bull Unigenitus*? 2°. Whether you accept the same? †

V. Since you expressly declare in Columbanus’s third

* This question is fully answered in the preceding Article, and at page 147, &c. of these sheets.

† Answer—The *Bull Unigenitus* has never yet been proposed as a *Test* to the Catholics of the British Islands; when it is, I shall answer that it has been condemned by the Sorbonne immediately after the death of Lewis XIV. When the Jesuite *Le Tellier*, Lewis’s Confessor, loaded with the public execration, was banished to *La Fleche*, where he soon after died; that the contest occasioned by *refusal of Sacraments* to such as would not subscribe the Bull, caused the insurrection of the French Magistracy. That the condemnation of the 91st Proposition, by which obedience to unjust Censures was enforced, was repugnant to moral obligations; that the refusal of Sacraments disturbed the tranquillity of private families; that those who persisted in refusing Sacraments were banished the Kingdom; that Pope Benedict XIV, fearful of the

letter, p. 21, that it is a "genuine Article of Catholic Faith, as stated by S. S. Jerom, Chrysostom, and others, that the *only* difference between a Priest and a Bishop, *jure divino*, consists in the power of *ordaining Priests!*" I request you say, whether you hold it to be a *genuine Article of Catholic Faith*, that there is *no* difference between a Priest and a Bishop, *jure divino*, in the power of Confirming, or in the power of Jurisdiction? *

I wish I could say, that the passages I have referred to, are the only exceptionable ones in your publications. At present I content myself with requesting you to send me an explanation of your doctrine on the subjects I have selected: this you will do by short and explicit answers to my questions.

I beg you to be assured that nothing but a pure motive of duty, and a sincere desire of promoting your good, could have impelled me to call on you in this manner: Believe me to be, in great solicitude for your eternal happiness,

Reverend Sir,

London,

4, Castle-Street, Holborn,

June 9th, 1812.

Your humble Servant in Christ,

WM. POYNTER, V. A. L. D.

storm, which thickened every day, issued a Brief, declaring that (since he could not condemn the Bulls of his Predecessors) the Bull Unigenitus should be Registered, but, that those who rejected it, ought to have the Sacraments *at their own risk*; and that this *political* middle course was called the *law of silence*, which caused the greatest scandal of all.

The Parliaments, disgusted rather than edified by this political middle course in matters of Religion, protested against it, and utterly suppressed the Bull, as repugnant to the liberties of the Gallican Church.

* I have repeatedly explained this—It was evident, from the commencement, that I had nothing in view but to rectify the Vicar of Castabala's inaccurate definition of a Bishop—"a Bishop, says he, is a Clergyman who *exclusively* administers two Sacraments, Confirmation and Holy Orders." Elucid. of the Veto, 1810, p. 36. Now the whole of what I assert with respect to Confirmation, is to shew that the power of Confirming is not *exclusively* Episcopal *Jure Divino*; and I repeat that assertion.

Dr. O'CONOR'S ANSWER to Dr. P.

Though the style of Dr. P's Letter was not of that gentle and conciliatory description, which is calculated to gain over by persuasive argument, rather than to intimidate by menace, I thought it became me to use more Ecclesiastical meekness, at least, as long as any hope remained for conciliation; and therefore, on the very day when I received his Letter, without consulting any other feelings than my own, I wrote an Answer, the substance of which may be seen in my *solemn Declaration*, Columbanus, No. v, page 69, to which I beg leave to refer.

I set out for Ireland June 18th, and never heard after of or from Dr. Poynter, until the 1st of August, when Mr. O'Connor of Dominick St. informed me that a report prevailed, and was propagated by Dr. Troy, that Dr. Poynter had proceeded against me for heterodoxy even so far as to denounce Sacramental excommunication. After the amicable Letter I had written to Dr. Poynter, June 10, I thought this quite incredible. I wrote to him however to inquire, and received his reply, dated London, August 11, 1812, in which he refers me for an answer to Letters which he says he had written to me on the 18th and 30th of June. As this reply was vague, and the Letters to which he referred me were never forwarded, my Brother wrote to him entreating that he would be more explicit.

Dr. P's Reply, dated from the *private* Synod of Durham, August 25, may be seen at p. 17* of the following sheets, where the necessity of self-defence has extorted from me a severity of language, which nothing short of *intentional* misrepresentation could justify. Let the first paragraph of his Letter of June 9, be compared, with the last of August 25. Providence has permitted this proof to be added to a thousand others, that in *private* Synods the Holy Ghost does not always preside.

One of the darling objects of that Synod, was to overwhelm by a Religious Cry, all those who dared to contend for the Canonical laws and liberties of the Catholic Church; against the abuses of Episcopal Government by *private* Synods and foreign intrigues. How then could *Columbanus* expect to be fairly dealt by in such a Synod of Vicars Apostolic as that of Durham? Was he summoned to attend! Was he allowed the privilege of being *heard* in self-defence. Had he any trial? any Counsel?—No—Nothing of this—That which is not refused to the vilest male-factors was denied to him! and by whom? by Christian Bishops! and where? in Algiers? No, in England! A pretty clear proof, that if the persons, who thus violate every principle of justice and of Canon Law, had the *power*, they want not the *will* to lay prostrate at their own tribunals, the most sacred principles of Canonical liberty and law.

Protestants of the British Islands! ascribe not these rash proceedings of individuals, either to the spirit or to the letter of the Catholic Religion. The most holy and venerable institutions shrink, like the sensitive plant, from the touch of man. The Government of the Catholic Church is not Monarchical, but mixed and tempered, like your own Monarchy, by Canonical Ordinances, which restrain the abuses of Episcopal power. as abundantly shewn by *Columbanus*.

Formerly there were no *private* Synods, such as are practised now; in Ecclesiastical matters all was, as it ought to be, candid, all above board. Fleury remarks, that hypocrisy and intrigue were excluded by publicity, that the grand object of Christian Councils, was to establish truth and justice, and of this who could be ashamed? They are only “the doers of evil who hate the light.” The ancient Bishops were not presumptuous; they did not pretend to be the exclusive depositories of truth; they mistrusted themselves, and they were not jealous of the superior learning or attainments of others. Synods properly conducted have this advantage, that

there is generally some one who has courage and abilities to combat for truth, so as to make a deep impression; and men are ashamed to be guilty of injustice in *public*; nor is it easy to corrupt all persons in a numerous assembly, whose deliberations are open to all the world, whereas it is very easy to corrupt individuals in private, and to mislead in the dark. See Fleury, Disc. 2, No. v.

Was the Synod of Durham such a Synod as Fleury describes? I scorn to answer, and proceed in my narrative.

Finding that justice was no longer to be expected, I published on the 14th of October, in Dublin, my *Solemn Declaration* that no suspension *ab officio et Ordine*, such as Dr. Poynter and the Dublin faction had boasted of having been issued against me in England, had ever been either *received* or *refused* by me, or tendered by any person to me, directly or indirectly, at any period of time.—A question of *fact* then arose from this *Declaration*, namely,—Who asserted the truth—Dr. Poynter or Dr. O'Connor?

On my return to England, I found in my Study a sealed Letter, which, from the superscription and post mark, I judged to be Dr. Poynter's Letter of July 18; how or when it came there, or why it was not accompanied by his Letter of July 30, or by what chance, or *contrivance*, the former was left on my table, and not forwarded like my other Letters to Ireland, and the latter was never heard of except by Dr. Poynter's report; all these are questions which nothing short of the mysterious wisdom of a secret Synod can disclose.

Determined, if possible, to discover the truth, I inclosed this Letter, of July 18, *unopened*, to Mr. Butler, of Lincoln's Inn, October 27, requesting of him to return it to Dr. Poynter, for the purpose of ascertaining whether it really was his. Mr. Butler returned it to me, *unopened*, October 31, with Dr. Poynter's answer, that "*probably* it was his Letter of the 18th of July." I returned it again, *unopened*, requesting a *positive*

admission of the fact that it was the Letter in question, with an endorsement to that effect *in Dr. Poynter's hand*, and Mr. Butler returned it so endorsed, November 10, 1812.

Would Dr. Poynter have so endorsed it, had he known the object I had principally in view, of securing myself against all suspicion of having ever read it, and giving him plain proof, *acknowledged under his own hand*, that I never had?

With this fact authenticated in my hand, I wrote to him a very respectful Letter, November 11, in which, after solemnly declaring, that if any Uncatholic Doctrine could be fairly pointed out from my writings, I would most cheerfully retract it, I said—"You will not be surprised at the caution with which I act, at a period when my character has been so falsely defamed by Professional persons (in Dublin.) I have reason to expect from that quarter every unfair advantage, and therefore I have taken the precaution of placing the Letter which you have endorsed, *still unopened*, in a cover, sealed up under a most respectable seal, and dated this day; and I do not foresee any circumstances, under which I shall be induced to open it. Certainly not until I receive from the person to whom your Letter of June 30 was intrusted, that Letter, with an explanation of the circumstances under which it has been with-held."

Right Rev. Dr. POYNTER to the Rev. Dr. O'CONOR.

(From the Original.)

REV. SIR,

The underwritten is a true Copy of the Letter I wrote and addressed to you on the 30th of last June; by which you were then forbidden, and, *for the reasons therein explained*, I hereby declare you *now forbidden* to say Mass in the London District.

4, Castle-Street, Holborn,
London, Nov. 17, 1812.

WM POYNTER, V. A. L.

REV. SIR,

On the 18th Instant I addressed a Letter to you, in which I acknowledged the receipt of your's of the 10th; and lamenting that you had returned no answer* to any of the questions, which I thought it my duty to propose to you in my Letter of the 9th Instant, I declared to you my judgment on your publication entitled *Historical Address*, &c. Part ii. and at the same time gave you notice, that unless I should receive the satisfaction required, within the course of seven days, from the date of my Letter, viz. June 18, 1812, it would then be my duty to forbid you to say Mass in the London District.

To my Letter of the 18th instant I have not received an answer.

I do now most sincerely lament, that you have not done what I felt it my duty to require of you, not less for your individual good, than for the satisfaction of the Church of Christ, and therefore on account of the scandalous nature and schismatical *tendency* of the said *Historical Address*, I do hereby forbid you ever more to say Mass in the London District, until you shall obtain express leave in writing so to do, either from myself personally, or from my Successor.

My grief in communicating this prohibition to you, can only be equalled by the joy I shall feel in restoring the permission to say Mass in the London District, when you shall have given satisfaction, and removed the scandal caused by your writings.

With *unfeigned* Charity, and sincere regard, I am,

Rev. Sir,

Your *afflicted* and most humble Servant in Christ,

4, Castle-Street, Holborn,
June 30, 1812.

WM. POYNTER, V. A. L.

Rev. Dr. O'CONOR.

True Copy, JOSEPH HODGSON, Vicar General.

This is gross misrepresentation.—I answered his Letter of the 9th on the 10th. See my *Solemn Declaration* of Oct. 14th, in *Columbanus*, No. 5.

REMARKS ON THIS LETTER.

The most formidable enemy man has to encounter, an enemy with whom he must be reconciled in this world, or by whom he must be overwhelmed in the next, is *Truth*! and yet a vain shadow of reputation, or pride of office, will induce us knowingly to take up arms against this inflexible antagonist, as if she were never to rise in judgment against us! Yes—we endeavour to stifle her even in our own consciences, to undermine her by artifice, or to overwhelm her by power, and we respect her only when she is bespangled with diamonds, or arrayed in all the formidable majesty of command, though we know that, whether in rags or in purple, she walks, inexorable, arm in arm with *eternity*. If millions of years were to pass away, it would still be true that Dr. Poynter *knew* when he wrote this Letter of the 17th, that I had never before received any *notice, monitory, or intimation of suspension* from him, that I had no time assigned me for any explanation, that I had no hearing in self-defence, that the most sacred laws of the Church have been thus violated with respect to me, and consequently that he is guilty of a *schismatical* act, by that very proceeding which, in his Letter of the 17th, he thus unblushingly avows! And does Dr. Poynter imagine that the Mitre acquits him, or that he can absolve himself from the indispensable duty of retraction? Is he not guilty of that crime of which Gregory VII. was convicted in the Council of Worms, “*fomenting schisms in private families, and rancorous dissensions amongst friends, by uncanonical Censures?*”

Whenever I hear that any man who, from political motives, has violated the laws of the Christian Church, is on the bed of death, if that person should be a Bishop, as the late Dr. Butler of Cork, I first inquire whether he has done homage to truth by a public and unequivocal retraction. What if, instead of retraction, I should hear—“No, but

he has been privately absolved," then I say—Woe to the hypocrite who has committed that sacrilegial,—Woe to *the Absolver* as well as to the *absolved*!

As soon as I received Dr. Poynter's Letter of the 17th, I wrote to him, November 18, 1812, requesting a copy of the *Instrument* under which he claimed authority over me, and a communication of the Canon under which he proceeded to exert it; I added, that I would wait ten days for his answer, and when ten days elapsed, I wrote to him, November 30, 1812, that since he had thought proper to refuse the documents I required, I could not recognize him as empowered by any law, human or Divine, to proceed as he had done.

It has been *decided*, in the cause of Pope Gregory VII, and of the French and Germans who resisted his Censures, that if any even *probable* reason should exist, to doubt of the legitimate authority of a Bishop, resistance is just, even though no other cause could be alleged. "Nemo schismaticus, aut excommunicatus, qui in causa, *probabiliter* justa, operator; vel *ex vitio electionis probabilis*, Superiorem non admittit, ejusve mandatis resistit," Council of Worms against Gregory VII. Compare the note at page 40 of the following sheets. The Irish Bishops themselves acknowledge that they have no correspondence with the Pope.—Who then appointed Dr. Poynter?—Again and again do I declare, that I shall never be overruled by proceedings, which are in direct violation of laws that have been sanctioned by the piety, and enacted by the wisdom of 1800 years! The celebrated Petavius has abundantly proved, that a simple Priest possesses "*vi ordinis*" the same power to consecrate the Eucharistic Elements that a Bishop has, or the Pope himself; and that he cannot be dispossessed of this power, but for the same reasons for which the Pope may, namely, *heresy, immorality, or schism*.*—

* "Itaque tanta est in Sacerdote quovis simplici consecrandi Corporis

Those pretended Devotees, says Fleury, who, on pretence of holy *obedience* make false consciences for themselves, running counter to laws which have been sanctioned by all antiquity, ought rather to scruple violating those laws, than on pretence of religious obedience, affect a *Devotee piety*, which is, in fact, rebellion against the Church ! *

Dominici potestas quanta in Episcopo, ipsoque adeo summo Pontifice." De Divina Hierarchia, l. 3, c. 13, n. 9, t. 3, p. 878.

Si aliquis Episcopus, aliquem Christianum contra Legem excommunicat, sibi potestatem ligandi tollit, et nulli vitam æternam potest tollere, si sui peccati illi eam non tollunt; et non convenit Christianum, qui non est incorrigibilis, nomine Christianitatis privare, et eum cum Diabolo collocare quem Christus sua morte de potestate Diaboli venit redimere, &c. Canon anni 871, apud Hincmar. t. 2, Oper. p. 689. Dom. Bouquet Recueil des Hist. de France, t. 7, p. 540.

* " On doit bien plutot se faire conscience de mepriser les Conciles et l' autorité de l' Eglise Universelle, &c. Fleury 12me Disc. n. iii, p. 414. Le flatterie et la complaisance servile sont des *vices odieux*. La liberté et la Courage a soutenir la verité sont des *vertus Chretiennes*, qui font partie de la pietè." Ibid.

" Dieu a permis des suites affreus des *opinions outres* sur l, excommunication, pour en desabuser, au moins, par l' experience." Fleury Disc. 3, n. xviii.

As long as ignorance prevails in Ireland, the people will not be able to ascertain the privileges of their National Church, and as long as they remain shackled by a refusal of Emancipation, they will be too weak to assert those privileges, even though they should well understand them. It is therefore the *interest* of the *sworn Delegates of a foreign Court* to impede the progress of knowledge and of Emancipation.

COLUMBANUS,

Nº. VI.

§ I. *True State of the Case of Columbanus.*

1. **W**HERE is that Apostolical Bishop who, like Fenelon, will acknowledge his error, and honestly confess that the ground of his precipitate censures is, not the *pretended heretical*, or *schismatical* doctrine of his antagonist, but because he feels his pretensions to *blind* obedience restrained by Canonical resistance, his claim to unlimited dominion over the Catholic Clergy of the British Islands refuted, and the *dangerous political tendency* of that claim unanswerably exposed? Give me the Bishop who will submit to that law of imperious *duty*, imposed by his own Church, and though he com-

mand no house of Loreto to fly over the Ægean or Icarian seas, and though he communicate no miraculous virtues to Druidic wells, I shall not scruple to believe, that the Recording Angel has written his name in the *book of life*.

But, unfortunately, there is a *pride of office* lurking in the breasts of men, which hesitates not to display its "*little brief authority*," even by *refusing the sacraments!* and declaring the gates of heaven shut against their opponents, rather than confess an error, or acknowledge a mistake! a mind, once tainted by this infection, forgets the experience of ages; unmindful that Penal Codes produce results diametrically opposite to the intentions of their framers, it flatters itself that an antagonist may sooner be subdued by force, than convinced by argument; that an *Algerine* Church government is preferable to a Canonical; and that he who can exert *lawless* domination over others, need not be very solicitous whether he possesses any command over himself.

Whether this *pride of office* distinguishes the conduct of the Vicars Apostolic towards Co-

lumbanus, it is not for Columbanus, but for the public to decide.—Sure I am however, that, if they had but *adhered to the laws of their own Church*, or allowed a *fair opportunity for explanation*, Columbanus would rather have abandoned some of the privileges of his order, than run the risk of all the obloquy which has arisen, to the great detriment of Catholicity, from the exorbitant abuses and intemperate exercise of Episcopal power.

2. Hitherto, whenever any writer was accused of heresy or schism, the imputed doctrines were *fairly quoted from his own writings*, and he was asked whether he *intended that meaning*, and whether he would retract, or explain. The iniquitous policy of frightening away the ignorant from truth by misrepresentation, or that of imputing to any man opinions which he rejects, and then condemning him for our own calumny, was deemed *a sin against the Holy Ghost*, for which there is no remission in this life or in the next; it was the artifice which the Devil employed against Christianity in its cradle!—If the author denied the imputation,

4 *Case of Columbanus stated.*

there was an end of the question. It were impious to *forge* a creed for any man, and then to punish him for our own forgery.

In the case of Columbanus, however, an opposite mode of proceeding has been adopted, which is repugnant to all law, human and divine. The Vicars have seen him repeatedly extending towards them the olive branch, solemnly protesting his willingness to retract, if any heterodoxy can be fairly imputed to him; *solemnly disavowing* the *Aerian* and *Jansenistical* doctrines, which malignity imputes; solemnly disclaiming any other principles than those of the Gallican Church; entreating of them to pause, ere they incur the guilt of causing to be imputed to their religion maxims of foreign domination, which have been proscribed by every Catholic State, and which raise insurmountable obstacles against the emancipation of their country! *

In vain!—In their Synod of Tullow, in 1809, and in their Dublin Synod, of 1812, they have

* See Columbanus's solemn declaration in his 5th No.

received, even with acclamation, the present Pope's Bulls, "*Qui Christi Vices*," and "*Ecclesia Christi*," which assert the dangerous doctrine of the Pope's *plenitude of power* above the canons, nay, even *expressly*, above *justice and equity* ! * They maintain that no power on earth can make laws for the spiritual kingdom ; that the discipline of Trent is as obligatory as the doctrines of Revelation ; that the second order of the Clergy have no right to judge of the faith which they teach to their flocks, but are to teach whatever doctrines, and enforce whatever censures their Bishops enjoin ; that Bishops can appoint their own Successors, † impose new *terms of communion*, and

* For the translation of this Bull into French, we are indebted to the late pious Bishop of S. Pol de Leon. See the *Appeal* of 38 emigrant French Bishops against it, London, printed by Dulau, 1804 ; Columbanus's Historical Address, Part ii, p. 27 ; and these Sheets, p. 192.

† To the laws of the Church against this infamous traffic of Bishoprics, published by Columbanus, in his preceding Numbers, add the following of the Council of Rome 998.

In Concilio Romano a Gregorio V, præsente Othone III Imperatore, A. D. 998, Gregorii ejusdem anno 3, Roberti vero

Test Acts, which have not been approved of by the Universal Church; depose from his functions any Clergyman, to whom they *impute* heresy or schism, without a trial or a hearing; and, without any form of process or judicature, bereave him of his title to that covenant of mercy, which was signed with the blood, and sealed by the death of J. C!

3. It will be admitted, that if the tenets of any Church can be ascertained by any unequivocal criterion, it is by a *Test* which *excludes from the sacraments*, and shuts the gates of redemption; and then it will follow, that according to the principles of Vicars Apostolic,

Regis anno 2, apud Labbè, t. ix, Concil. col. 772, Acherium, Spicil. t. 2, p. 68, et Maurinos Rer. Gallicar. t. x, p. 535.

“Stephanus S. Ecclesiæ Vallavensis dictus Episcopus, ut *omni ordine Sacerdotali careat*, auctoritate Apostolica edicimus, eo quod a Widone, *vivente Episcopo, avunculo et prædecessore suo*, sit electus, sine Cleri et populi voluntate, ac post ejus mortem, a duobus tantum Episcopis, non provincialibus, sit ordinatus.”—Again—“*Canonica auctoritas est, in una Civitate duos Episcopos non esse, nec, vivente Episcopo, successorem sibi debere eligere. Ac idcirco, ulla quacunque causa, Regulæ Ecclesiæ præte iri, in tanto ordine fixæ, non debent.*” Rer. Gallicar. t. vi, p. 190, edit Benedictina Dom. Bouquet.

the above doctrines, for opposing which they exclude Columbanus from the *book of life*, are *essential* articles of the Catholic Religion!

If Columbanus had denied the Trinity, or the Divinity of our Saviour, what more could they have done, than what they have done for the enforcing of those tenets? *Exclusion from sacraments* is the last, the most tremendous, punishment the Church can inflict!

Here then it is ascertained, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the *political* maxims of the Roman Court, are incorporated by those Vicars with the Catholic Religion, so as to render them *essential* to that religion, being a *sine qua non* for the sacraments!

Now, are the Catholics of the British Islands prepared to stand before the supreme *Court* of Parliament, with a petition for emancipation in one hand, and these foreign maxims, which have been so often proscribed, even by our own Catholic Parliaments, in the other?—I trust in God's mercy that they will not. If they do, then we must date from that moment a new order of things. Their's will no longer be the

contest of piety for the *faith of their Ancestors*, for the genuine *laws of their Church*. No longer will they be able to say we are excluded and persecuted for the word of God. No—they must unfurl the standard of a *Nuncio Rinuccini*, and die—Martyrs—forsooth—for those very maxims of *Court* policy, which have been indignantly rejected by a *Bossuet* ! *

Catholics of the British Islands! in the name of every thing that is dear to honourable and religious minds, ponder well, ere you allow these *political* maxims to be imputed to your religion!—You have a most awful responsibility hanging over your heads. You are answerable to unborn generations, and, remember, that History will be revenged !

* See the great Bossuet's *Defensio Cleri Gallicani*.

Pragmatique de S. Louis.

“ Ne demandez plus ce que c'est que les *Libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane*: Les viola toutes dans ces precieuses paroles de l'ordonnance de S. Louis—*le droit commun*, et la puissance des *Ordinaires selon les Conciles Generaux, et les institutions des SS. Peres*—Nous n'en voulons *jamais connaitre d'autres*. Nous mettons notre liberté, a etre *sujets aux Canons*.” Bossuet Sermon de l'unité de l'Eglise, part 2.

Consider that these maxims, which were always formidable to Catholic States, are ten times more so to Protestant, and that, with them, it is morally impossible for you to obtain admittance into the sanctuary of the constitution.—Are you jealous of your Protestant neighbours or Landlords, and not at all of foreign powers? Is it not the *interest* of Protestants that you should be rich and prosperous, and the interest of foreigners that, under pretence of *conscience*, you should be their slaves? You will find by the documents I lay before you, that the very sacraments may be made instrumental to your political destruction, when a fair opportunity occurs, unless the *refusal* as well as the administration of them is regulated by the salutary wisdom of *Canonical* legislation.

Professions of allegiance, are very commendable things; but remember that such *professions* were common from 1649 to the revolution, and yet that few periods abounded more in religious iniquity than that *very* religious age! So many censures were then issued, on pretence of religion, but really for political purposes,

10 *Security against Political Censures.*

that it may be properly called *the age of excommunications*. Never was more detestable treachery masked by more plausible professions, never more treasons hatched with more loyal and religious appearances. Perjury and equivocation have been so systematically pursued, that I should not wonder if professions were abolished, and death for detection of falsehood substituted in their stead!—You must give ample security against foreign Bulls, by the establishment of a *Canonical* instead of a *lawless*, and despotical Church; * you must enact by law, that no Clergyman be condemned without *Canonical conviction*, or *confession*; † and that

* This was done even in the Spanish Netherlands. See the *Jus Belgarum contra Bullas Pontificas*.

† This is one of the most venerable and *necessary* laws of the Catholic Church, as shall be seen in the sequel.

“Si quis illicite quemquam excommunicat, *semetipsum non illum condemnat*.” Pope Gregory the Great, l. 2, Ep. 26. Again---“*Caveant Judices Ecclesiastici, ne, absente eo cujus causa ventilatur, sententiam proferant, quia errita erit, et causam in Synodo pro facto debunt*.” Concil. Carth. iv. Can. 30. Was Columbanus so much as informed that his cause was to be discussed either in the private Synod of *Durham*, or of *Dublin*? No---and much less was he asked to attend! Therefore the sentences of those Bishops are not only *null* and

no Bishop be censured by Rome, except according to the discipline which prevailed in the Gallican, and formerly in the English Church.*

In Episcopal censures, especially against authors who dare to point out the *abuses* of Episcopal power, *you know* that there is more of *policy* than of religion. Look to the History of *Rinuccini*.—Look to the excommunication of *Clanricard*.—Look to the recent *Bulls of deposition* fulminated against the exiled Bishops and Clergy of France!

void, but, for this *violation of the laws of the Church*, they have incurred the very censures which they have issued, and have rendered themselves *Parties* and *Judges* at the same time! Gratian Caus. 3, Quæst. 9.

S. Aug. says, Ep. 162.—“ Nos a communione quenquam prohibere *non possumus*, nisi sponte *confessum* aut *convictum*. Quis enim sibi utrumque audeat assumere, ut cuiquam ipse sit et accusator et Judex?” S. Aug. Ep. 137, and Hom. 50. Justinian Novel 125, c. 11. Bingham’s Christian Antiq. B. 16, c. 3, n. 10, t. 2, folio, p. 59, &c.

* I have been informed that Dr. Poynter has expressed his *fear of being censured by Rome*, if he did not excommunicate Columbanus. This was the answer of the Irish Bishops who excommunicated Lord Clanricard, when they were charged with that sacrilegious abuse of spiritual power.—This is the *foreign influence* of 1650 existing in 1813!

Countrymen! You may be well assured, that the question is not whether Columbanus is a *heretic* or *schismatic*, but whether he has opposed the arbitrary maxims of a foreign Court, and inflicted a wound on the *undue influence* which that Court has always exercised over the mass of the populace of Ireland!

§ II. *Policy of Dr. Poynter's Censures.* *

1. Previously to issuing censures, Dr. Poynter published a Pamphlet, in which he confesses that "*it is difficult to lay hold of any proposition of Columbanus's, and say what is his precise doctrine;*"—and yet, labouring under the fear of foreign censures, he declares Columbanus *an innovator*!—at a time when he and I were on terms of friendly intercourse! and without asking my *own sense* of those passages, which he himself acknowledges to be of *dubious* meaning! and in order to justify this course of proceeding, he ascribes to me the doctrines of *Aerius*, which he knows that I utterly condemn!—In

* For a full exposition of this Policy, see the *Chronology of events* at the end of these sheets.

short, I have information, from good authority, that Dr. P. is *afraid* to act otherwise than he has done; that he has been menaced with a Bull by Dr. Milner; that foreign powers hang, like a millstone, about his neck; and that foreign censures are, even in the Pope's present state of captivity, the order of the day!

2. "Oh?—says Dr. P.—but Dr. O'C. refuses *submission and obedience* to his legitimate superior, and he denies the superiority of *Bishops above Priests, jure Divino.*"

I deny both these charges—I have denied them from the very commencement of this controversy, "*in ipso limine.*" The very persons who urge them, *know them to be false.* It is in order to cover the injustice of their proceedings that they calumniate my orthodoxy! Why does Dr. P. call upon me *officially* to declare, whether I receive *any of the articles of Christian faith*, which have been decided by the Œcumenical Councils, *including even the four first*, but to make the vulgar believe that I do not receive them? He knows in his heart that I do. He knows it from my writings. I have ex-

pressly mentioned my unfeigned submission to every article of Catholic faith. What then can be his object in proposing to me such a Test, but to create suspicions of my orthodoxy, and to establish arbitrary command. A charitable mind would interpret charitably, even in dubious matters; but he tortures to the very worst, in order to silence his opponent by excommunication!

No—Never have I denied canonical submission to any Bishop. What Dr. P. wishes to establish, is *blind* submission; and *that*, I never promised, and *that*, never will I pay.

By such censures he could lay learning prostrate at the feet of ignorance; reduce Parish Priests to mere *machines*; order their flocks to separate from them without a *Canonical cause*; and compel the rabble, by *refusal* of sacraments, to close their Oratories against us, in compliance with Dr. Milner's literary revenge!

Why has not Dr. P. pointed out some heretical passage in Columbanus?—Let us fancy him making the experiment.—He ponders over every page; he pulls to pieces every

paragraph; he tortures every word.—In vain! Another paragraph, another, and another, rises in judgment against him, and stares him in the face!—Defeated in argument, but not softened by charity, he lays him down to rest; his rest is interrupted by dreams; the angry spirits of a *Pandolf* and a *Bellarmino*, hover about his pillow; he rises, with a brain disturbed by the visions of the night; he makes new efforts; some passages he misinterprets, others he garbles, others he misquotes!—but yet, again he fails; not one passage can he allege that is repugnant to the *faith*, or to the *genuine* discipline of the Catholic Church!

Shall it then be said, that the mitre is disgraced by calumny, or defeated in argument? No! rather let any other calamity befall us, than Columbanus not be condemned! A Vicar Apostolic has declared, that he *must retract*! True it is that his cause has been *prejudged*, but a Vicar's prediction *must* be verified!

Yes—One expedient remains.—A new *Test Act* shall be proposed to him, which he will certainly reject, if he had no other reason

than because it is *new*. That will afford an ostensible pretext for his suspension; and if, after suspension, he still refuse to submit, he shall be interdicted Christian communion; he shall be pointed out to his Countrymen as an *outcast*, not to be believed even on his oath, when he writes on *abuses*. He shall stand as a blasted oak, struck by the lightnings of heaven, which a Vicar Apostolic shall fulminate. Then, shorn of his honours, palsied and parched in his career, he shall be conspicuous to future writers, who may dare to notice the proceedings of Episcopal Synods, or to interfere with their absolute and uncontrollable Decrees! And lest it should be imagined that Dr. Poynter has acted thus rigorously from motives of pique, Letters shall be written to Ireland, stating that he is not the first who has proceeded to these extremities. These Letters shall insinuate that Dr. Douglas has proceeded to the same extremity, and *assigned good reasons* for the same degradation! *

* Mr. O'Connor, of Belanagare, wrote to Dr. Poynter, requesting a Categorical answer to two questions; *first*,

Then Columbanus shall be numbered, even by his Countrymen, with those who have gone

whether he had suspended Dr. O'Connor from *all* Ecclesiastical functions, even that of celebrating the Mass; *secondly*, if so, for what crime? Dr. P. returned the following reply:---

Durham, Aug. 25, 1812.

MY DEAR SIR,

Your kind favour of the 14th instant, has been forwarded to me at Durham, which place I shall leave in a few days to return to London. In reply to your inquires, I am sorry to have to inform you, that *all* the spiritual powers which had been granted by the late Rt. Rev. Dr. Douglas, to the Rev. Dr. C. O'Connor, and even the *licence* to say Mass in the London District, have been withdrawn from the same Rev. Dr. O'C. The *reasons* for withdrawing the said powers, and *forbidding* him to say Mass in the London District, *have been assigned in the Letters, addressed by Dr. Douglas and myself to your brother.* With *sincere* sentiments of esteem and regard, I have the honour to be,

Dear Sir,

Your most humble Servant,

H. POYNTER."

Now, Dr. Poynter *knows* that no such *suspension, reasons, or letters*, were ever addressed by Dr. Douglas to me!--I grieve to be thus compelled, by the *necessity of self-defence*, to accuse a Christian Bishop of *deliberate* misrepresentation!---- I refer to three original documents---Mr. Ch. Butler's Letter

in the way of *Cain*, and perished in the rebellion of *Core!* who are as dark spots in the feast of charity! clouds without rain, that are borne on the wings of the angry winds! or like the raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion! or as wandering comets, to which are reserved the mansions of darkness, for all eternity. Yea—it shall fare with him as with the mountains of Gelboa, upon which the dew of heaven shall never descend!

of October 18, 1811, Mr. Strickland's of Feb. 5, 1812, and Dr. Poynter's of June 9, written after Dr. Douglas's death.

With respect to a *License* to say Mass---I abstain from commenting on the profaneness of that expression, for which I refer to the vocabularies of Revenue Officers, and to the annals of the Pot-house; and I confine myself to a solemn assertion, that *never* have I applied for permission to exercise that solemn function, either to Dr. Douglas, or to him, or to any other person, since I was ordained, and that is now 27 years!

Priests exercise that right *ordinaria potestate*, in virtue of *ordination*, precisely by the *same Charter*, by which Bishops exercise their's; nor can any Priest be deprived of it, until he is convicted of a crime.—As this doctrine seems new to Dr. Poynter, I refer him to Petavius.---“Itaque tanta est “in Sacerdote quovis simplici consecrandi Corporis Dominici “potestas, quanta in Episcopo, ipsoque adeo summo Pontifici.” De Divina Hierarchia, l. 3, c. 13, n. 9, p. 878.

Such is the present state of the controversy between Dr. P. and Columbanus! such his new Test-Act! such his Politico-Religious bill of exclusion against Dr. O'Connor. Let us now examine for what *crime* is this punishment incurred.

§ III. *Popes and Cardinals guilty of Schism and Scandal, if Columbanus is so.*

1. Countrymen—I scorn the imputation of endeavouring to evade any objection which may be fairly advanced against my writings—I detest the vile duplicity of disguising my opinions; my conduct is visible; open to the discussion of the whole world; if a doctrine is immoral I call it so, and *I assign my reason*; if heretical or schismatical I proceed in the same way. Every dunce may *doubt*, every knave may *assert*. I enquire, and I *allow others to enquire*, what the word *Spiritual* means—It surely can be no sin to open a Theological Dictionary, in order to know the meaning of the words *Schismatical*, *pious ears*, *Jansenist*, *Heretical*!

181 *Columbanus falsely accused of Schism.*

No one will pretend that Holden was either an heretic or a schismatic, when in his excellent work intitled *Analysis Fidei*, l. 2. c. 8, he made the following remarks:—"The epithets *scandalous, offensive to pious ears, schismatical,* cannot be applied to such opinions as only give occasion of scandal to the *rude and the ignorant.*—*Truth*, as S. Thomas of Aquin sayth, ought not to be deserted on account of the *passive scandal* which some may take, because it is opposite to the practice of some *devout people*, for it is manifest that there be *many abuses.*"

Pope Adrian VI, declared by his Legate, at the Diet of Neuremberg in 1522, that "some abominable things have crept into the Holy See; some abuses in matters *Spiritual*; and it is no wonder if the infection has descended from *the head to the members*, from the Pope to the *under Prelates*," &c.—If then *Columbanus* is a *Schismatic* for having noticed these *abuses*, so was Pope Adrian VI!

The Committee of Bishops who were appointed by the Council of Trent, to examine

and report on the *abuses*, which called for reform in the Catholic Church, use the following words, in their Remonstrance to Pope Paul III.

“Your Holiness well knows that the origin of
“those evils which inundate the Catholic
“Church, must be referred to some of your own
“predecessors, who collected about them a
“swarm of *vile flatterers*, and *false doctors*,
“who taught that the Pope is the *absolute*
“*Master* of all Church livings, and that the
“*will of the Pope is the Law of the Church.*”

This instrument is signed by four of the greatest Cardinals of that age, by *Contarini*, *Carafa*, *Sadolet*, and *Pole*. Therefore—consequently, *ergo*—if I am guilty of *scandal* and *schism*, for asserting that the *will* of the Pope is *not the Law of the Church*, those learned Cardinals were equally scandalous and schismatical!

I pass by the *Centum gravamina*, or hundred grievances, which all the Catholic States of Germany, assembled at the Diet of Neuremberg in 1522, addressed to Pope Adrian VI. and I

dare to appeal to the Catholic world, that if schism or scandal can be imputed to Columbanus for objecting to some practices which, under the *false* appellation of *Church Discipline*, have been latterly introduced into England and Ireland; for instance, Bishops *naming their own Successors*, excluding the second order from Synods, proposing *new Tests and Creeds*, which have never been proposed by the Church, that great and orthodox Canonist *Vanespen* is equally guilty, for he and *Fleury*, and hundreds of orthodox Divines, have objected to the same practices, as innovations repugnant to the *genuine Discipline* of Catholicity; and they add moreover, that “nothing can be more pernicious than to suppose *that* to be the *Discipline of the Church*, which we generally see *practised*, or to pretend that the ancient discipline is abrogated, because contrary customs prevail !” *

* Extat in fasciculo rerum expetendarum pag. 17 et totidem verbis in Pontani Carmelitæ libro 2do Rerum Memor. pag. 74. Vanespen Jus Canon.

§ IV. *Claims of the Bishops exclusive Jurisdiction jure Divino, refuted.*

- 1. It has indeed been asserted, " that Dr. O'C. is Schismatical in not elevating the Episcopal dignity to a much greater height than he does above the Sacerdotal."—But if he is scandalous or schismatical in not indulging Episcopal vanity or ambition, so is that great Bishop S. John Chrysostom, so are all the Fathers, whose words may be seen at the bottom of this, and of the following pages, as translated by Estius, Christopherson, and Valesius, all of whom agree with S. John Chrysostom. *

No—not one syllable have I advanced on this subject, which has not been *much more forcibly* advanced by the Fathers; so forcibly

* " Quoniam inter Episcopum atque Presbyterum interest *ferme nihil*, quippe *et Presbyteris Ecclesiæ cura permissa est*, et quæ de Episcopis dixit Apostolus, ea etiam Presbyteris congruunt. *Sola namque ordinatione superiores illi sunt*, atque hoc tantum plusquam Presbyteri habere videntur." Chrysost. Hom.

22 *Columbanus falsely accused of Schism.*

indeed, that the Council of Trent has deemed it wise to abstain from any decision, notwithstanding all the preponderating influence of the Court of Rome. If then the expressions of those Fathers are Catholic, so *a fortiori*, are mine; and then it will follow, that Dr. P. has not only violated those rules of charity which, as a Bishop, he is bound to be *foremost* in cultivating, but that he has also betrayed ignorance and malignity, in first torturing my words to heterodoxy, and then suspending me for his own interpretation!

Would a Primitive Bishop have acted so? Would he not rather have endeavoured to soften, and interpret in a *favourable* sense? Would he not rather have spread the net, and hunted the thicket for the wandering sheep, than endeavoured to banish him by unseasonable and unprofitable barking from the fold?

Yes—I challenge him, in the face of all the thinking and discerning part of the world, to shew that I have advanced any proposition so strong as S. Jerom's, who distinctly says, that there is *no necessity even for Consecration*, in

the appointment of Bishops; and that, for 200 years, from the days of S. Mark, the Bishops of Alexandria were instituted by the Presbyters of that Apostolical See, without *any consecration, or any form, or ceremony, more than that of election from amongst themselves*; and such an election as was *usual*, when an Emperor was elected by the army, or an Archdeacon by Deacons, his own fraternity! *

Every one knows that, in S. Jerom's days, and for a whole century after his death, the Emperors were inaugurated without any

* S. Hieron. in Ep. ad Titum. c. 1, et Epist. 85.

In proof of this Doctrine, he quotes Acts xx, Hæbr. xiii, Philippians i, 1 Peter v; and he concludes thus:—"Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt se, *ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine*, ei qui sibi Præpositus fuerit, esse subjectos, ita Episcopi noverint se magis *consuetudine*, quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, et *in commune* debere Ecclesiam regere."

The learned Pere Morin's remark on S. Jerom's doctrine is:—*Contendit Presbyterum idem esse cum Episcopo*, atque hoc *demonstrat ex speciali et extraordinaria Alexandrinorum consuetudine*, qui *nullam adhibent consecrationem, nulla verba ut consecrent in Episcopum electum a se Presbyterum, sed tantum in solio collocant, et appellant Episcopum*, quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi Archidiaconum.

24 *Difference between Priests and Bishops.*

consecration, merely by the salutations of the soldiery. *—One of the first Christian authors who mentions Regal consecration, is our own countryman *Adamnan*, who died in 702; †

* Pancirolli *Rer. Memor. Francofurti* 1546, p. 211—Tit. xlv. Quomodo salutati fuerint Imperatores, &c.

† The story of S. Remigius's Vial from Hinmear is modern in comparison with *Adamn. Vita Columbæ* l. 3, c. 5. This chapter has never yet been sufficiently explained. "Angelum Domini ad se missum vidit (*Columba*) qui in manu vitreum ordinationis Regum habebat librum, in quo ei erat commendatum, *Aidanum* in Regem ordinare."—The Christian Emperors, about this time, began to assume the title of Pontifices Maximi. See *Bosius De Pontificatu Maximo Imperatorum Christianorum*. Jenæ 1656, 4to.

These learned Dissertations of *Bosius*, have been reprinted by the indefatigable Grævius, in his 5th vol. *Antiquit. Roman.* Pagi, superior, perhaps, in learning, but not in argument, to *Bosius*, opposes broken fragments to his solid Statues, A.C. 312, § 15, 19, and 313, 7, &c. but *Tillemont*, more learned and more accurate than Pagi, has decided the controversy, t. 4, *Hist. Imper.* p. 580, &c. The Emperor *Gratian* refused the title, in compliment to the Pope. *Constantine* affirmed, that in *external Discipline* he was *chief Bishop* of the Christian Church. *Euseb. Vita Const.* l. 4. c. 24; and this too, in his address to the Council of Nice. Ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἰσῶ της Ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεῶ καθεσταμένους."

The Bishops applauded this speech, though *Constantine* was not yet baptised! *Allatius* indeed endeavours to explain away τῶν ἐτὸς by *mere civil matters*; and *De Marca* says, it related only to his *Pagan subjects*, "de Gentilibus

Difference between Priests and Bishops. 25

and yet, to this mode of appointment, by *mere election*, without consecration, S. Jerom compares the appointment of Bishops; and that too, expressly for the purpose of shewing that there is no difference by divine institution, between a Priest and a Bishop, *except in the power of ordination*; nor any other difference, even by Ecclesiastical institution, than that which subsists between *Deacons and Archdeacons!*

Are our Bishops so ignorant of the Antiquities of the Christian Church, as not to know that this opinion was the *most universally received*, not only in the days of S. Jerom, but

“adhuc extra Ecclesiam constitutis,” De Concord Sacerd. et Imp. II. 10, p. 91. But the immortal Fabrici shews their want of common candor in explaining the sense, both of Eusebius and of Constantine; and all the annals and monuments of that age refute their assertions. In the very same place, and in the preceding and subsequent chapters, Eusebius expressly mentions, *Imperial Ecclesiastical Laws* for the Church. And all the Christian Emperors, whether Arian or Catholic, have enacted such Laws, from that day to this, “*qualibus referti sunt omnes Annales, plena omnia monumenta.*” And yet the Irish Bishops have resolved in their Dublin meeting, Nov. 18, 1812, that they, *exclusively*, have a right to decide on *all matters* relating to the faith and discipline of the Irish Catholic Church!

26 *Difference between Priests and Bishops.*

for ten centuries after; so much so, that what they have dared to do, in condemning it, the Council of Trent has not ventured to do, though invested with supreme power!

Aye—they have done much more, for Columbanus has not gone half so far as S. Jerom! Has he ever denied the necessity of Episcopal *consecration*? has he ever denied the superior jurisdiction of Bishops over Priests, with respect either to ordaining or confirming, or sitting and voting in Councils? has he not expressly mentioned his assent to the *Doctrinal* decisions of the Council of Trent, one of which is the superiority of Bishops over Priests? and has he not expressly said that, though Priests in the care of souls, have *a right to vote* in Synods, *jure Divino*, and to administer confirmation in cases of necessity, yet they are to exercise these rights in their *subordinate* degree, but not to be *excluded from them*, by wordly pride and arrogance, more than they were in the first Council of Jerusalem.*

* I have referred Dr. Poynter to the Doway Translation of the word *πρεσβυτερος*; I now refer him to the Rhemish, printed *with privilege*: Antwerp 1600, Annot. to Acts xv.

If I am to be censured for that proposition, so are the Acts of the Apostles, c. xv, and then

p. 336.—“ Two heresies are refuted by this passage; the first, “ of those who would have *all men* to give voice, or to be present in Councils; the second, of those who would have none “ but the *elect*—both are refuted by this example, where we “ see none but Apostles *and Priests*, or Auncients; neither “ did ever any other in the auncient Councils of the Church, “ assemble to *debate and define* the matter, but such, tho’ “ many other for other causes be ever present.” Here the translators quote Deut. 17. Mal. 2, 7. The lips of the *Priest* shall keep knowledge, and the law *thou shalt require of his mouth*; and again, Aggæ 2, 12. *Ask the law of the Priest*; and they infer, “ much more must wee referre al to our “ Bishops *and Pastors*, whom God hath placed *in the regiment of the Church*,” &c. They then quote S. Jerom’s words—“ Al the multitude held their peace, and into his “ (Peter’s) sentence, James the Apostle and *al the Priests did “ passe together*.” p. 337. In their remark on Acts xx. 28. Take heede to yourselves and to the whole flock over which the H. Ghost hath *placed you* Bishops to rule the Church of God—they remark on the words *placed you*, “ i. e. Bishops or “ *Priests*, Governors of the Church of God.”

If then I am to be condemned for these expressions, so are these translators of Doway and Rheims.—N. B. The Text which they quote, Acts xx, 21, is that which the English and Irish Vicars have *corrupted*, for the *express purpose* of shewing that Bishops are *exclusively to govern the Church*! See Columbanus, No. IV. page 20, &c. Compare Boehmer observ. Select ad Petr. de Marca pag. 23, where he quotes 1 Tim. v. 17, Claudius Fonteius de Antiquo Presbyterorum jure in Regimine Ecclesiæ, and *Le Gros* de Ecclesia.

28 *Difference between Priests and Bishops.*

S. Jerom, who exemplifies his doctrine in the following words:—

—“*Nam et Alexandria a Marco Evangelista, usque ad Heraclum et Dionysium Episcopos Presbyteri semper unum, ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant (not consecrabant) quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, et Archidiaconum vocent. Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat?*”

This passage from S. Jerom is quoted by the Fathers with approbation and applause, throughout a period of twelve centuries, from the days of S. Jerom to the Council of Trent; and not only has it never been condemned as heretical or schismatical, but the Fathers who have approved and adopted it as their own, have also asserted that *Priests consecrated the Chrism*, and usually administered Confirmation in the Bishop's absence; so as clearly to evince, that no power was *exclusively* confined to the Episcopal order, *jure Divino*, but that of *ordination alone*.*—Morin says, that this was the *prepon-*

* “*Nam in Alexandria, et, per totam Ægyptum, si desit Episcopus, consecrat (i. e. confirmat) Presbyter.*” Auctor Quæstionum in V. et N. Testament, qui S. Augustino anti-

derating doctrine for ten centuries !* In his observations on the ancient work "*de septem gradibus Ecclesiæ*," in which the same doctrine is repeatedly asserted, he says, "This author also maintains the doctrine of the original equality of Priests and Bishops, with relation to the Government of the Church; and he also argues, from the fact, that *Priests consecrated the Chrism, and administered Confirmation, in cases of necessity.* †

To this day, the Greek Priests administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, in ordinary; ‡

quior est, inter opera S. Aug. t. 4, quæst 101. Again--
 "Primum Presbyteri Episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente uno, sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri *consignant*, si præsens non sit Episcopus." S. Ambros. Comment. in Epist. Pauli ad Timoth 1, c. 4.

* De Sacris ordin. part 3. Exercit. 3, c. 2, p. 31, &c.

† "Ideo ait Presbyteros, in necessitate positos, *chrisma conficere*, et nonnullas Ecclesias id observare." Ib. n. xi. p. 32. Compare the word *Consignatorium* in Du Cange. These are, all of them, Catholic Authors.

‡ Holstenius Bibliothecarian of the Vatican, in Dissert. "*De forma et Ministro Sacramenti Confirmationis apud Græcos.*" Rom. 8o. 1666. Martene de Ritib. Sacris. l. 1, Menardus in Sacramentarium Gregorii, p. 143, &c. "Latini per Episcopum, Græci per *Presbyterum etiam.*" See Larro-

30 *Difference between Priests and Bishops.*

and all the *learned* are aware of the controversy on *Confirmation by Priests*, between the two Catholic writers Sirmundus and Petrus Aurelius; neither of whom was censured, or condemned. † In Pere Morin's work, on the Sacrament of Confirmation, he contends, that it has been administered even by *Deacons*; and, yet for this assertion, he was never condemned. It was a question of historical fact, for which no man can be censured, unless we claim a *Spiritual* power to destroy the monuments of nations, to arrest the course of tradition, to pollute its sources, and to introduce scepticism into the history of man!

2. I am compelled, by the ignorance of persons, who presume to wield arms with which they are most shamefully unacquainted, to dwell a little longer on this subject, in order to point out to them sources of information of which they are utterly unaware. Let them

que III, 7, *Adversarior Sacr. Leo Allatius* de Synodo Photiana. Benedict xiv. De Synodo l. 7. c. 7, 8.

† Sirmond's Works, t. 4, Paris, fol. 1646. Compare Grotius Epist. 139.

Difference between Priests and Bishops. 31

read our countrymen *Sedulius's* Commentary on the first to Titus. There, if any tattered remnant of virtue remains, they will blush at their own ignorance and presumption, in censuring history, and condemning truth; when, to their utter confusion, they will find S. Jerom's doctrine repeatedly maintained, even in his own words! Let them consider, that *Sedulius* was one of the most learned men of the age; that he was one of the Fathers of the Irish Church; that on account of his eminent learning and sanctity, he was invited to assist in a Roman Council, by Pope Gregory II. that he was afterwards elected Bishop of Oreto; that the learned world have to lament the loss of his *History of Ireland*, written in the eighth century;* that he is extolled by the learned Benedictine *Trithemius*, by *Sixtus Senensis*, and by *Cellier*, as one of the greatest luminaries of that century; that, in maintaining S. Jerom's opi-

* Harris and others inform us that this *History* written in Gothic Characters, was in the possession of Sir *John Higgins*, first physician to Philip the Vth. See Usher Primord, c. 16, Harris p. 47, Cellier, t. 10, p. 632, Ware's Writers, p. 7, and Colgan's Acts, p. 320.

32 *Difference between Priests and Bishops.*

nion, he only follows the example of *S. Isidore of Sevil*; and that they who have so hastily censured *Columbanus*, must, *a fortiori*, condemn both.* What, if it may, without impiety, be supposed, that the spirits of the departed are allowed invisibly to witness the actions of those whom they have instructed by their doctrines, or edified by their lives, or governed by their piety, may we not fancy those luminaries of the Christian world, raising their venerable heads from their tombs, in the plains of *Iberia*, addressing some pious Hibernian, who may now be fighting under the standard of a Wellington; and lamenting, amid the din of arms, and the clangor of war, that Ireland, once an Island of Religious *Saints*, is now become an Academy of Religious *Politicians*! that formerly Europe was enlightened by a *Columba*, Apostle of the Picts; *Columban*, Apostle of the Burgundians; *Gal*, Apostle of Switzer-

* Their words may be seen quoted by Pere Morin with those of Bede, Alcuin, the French, Italian, and German Bishops, assembled at Aquisgrane in 819, c. 10. Amalarius de offic. c. 13, *S. Anselm*, and many more.

land; *Aidan*, of Northumberland; *Kilian*, of Franconia; but now, instead of charitably contending for Catholic *Religion*, Irishmen are becoming the despotic Apostles of *exclusive* Episcopal *dominion*, in *all matters* relating to the Church! contending for maxims of *political Popery*, which sanctify oppression, and may recommend them to mitres or to Cardinal's hats, as soon as the Pope shall be restored! For this are they inculcating, at Maynooth, the Pope's *unlimited power*; for this involving in their angry and imprudent censures, all those Fathers, who have taught much stronger doctrines than those of Columbanus! for this are they naming their own Successors! for this introducing new *Test Acts*! and maintaining the *dangerous* and infamous *doctrine*, that even *unjust* censures must be obeyed!

And is it to be supposed, that, for the purpose of accommodating himself, by sycophant compliance, to maxims of foreign influence and *blind* submission, which have *barbarized his* country, *Columbanus* will condemn *S. Jerom*,

*S. Chrysostom, S. Anselm,** and the whole of the Latin Church! that such censures will frighten him into a tame, servile, *blind*, undiscerning submission, by which he would betray the Religion of his Ancestors! that he will flatter the prejudices of the ignorant, or court the popularity, or shape himself out by the superstitions of the populace!

No—your Bishops must read before they censure; they must be *cautious*, and not *cap-tious*, before they condemn. In censuring

* S. Anselm says of S. Jerom, “Excellentiam Presbyterorum declarat, dum eosdem qui Presbyteri sunt, *Episcopos esse* manifestat. Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui cæteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedio factum est. Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Herac-lam, &c.”—Here quoting S. Jerom’s words, he compares the appointment of a Bishop to that of an Archdeacon, and he concludes, “*Constat ergo, Apostolica institutione, omnes Pres-byteros esse Episcopos.*” Comment. in c. 1, Ep. ad Philip.

He repeats this in 1 Tim. c. 3, and again 1 Titus; and he concludes---“Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt *se, ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine*, ei qui sibi præpositus fuerit esse subjectos, *ita* Episcopi *noverint magis se consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicæ* veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, et in *communi* debere *Ecclesiam regere.*”

Columbanus, they have censured the Fathers of the Catholic Church. Betraying the *haughty* humours, manifesting shameful ignorance, and enforcing *blind obedience*, they have dared to *anathematize* opinions which the Council of Trent, in its wisdom, did not venture to censure, and much less to excommunicate from freedom of enquiry, or to debar from liberty of defence ! *

2. "Oh!—but Dr. O'Connor maintains the "heresy of Acrius, that there is no difference "*jure Divino* between a Bishop and a Priest."

* The whole evidence is thus summed up by the learned Pere Morin---"Sententia igitur S. Hieronymi, ejus-
"que verba mirum in modum S. Anselmo, *universisque Pa-*
"*tribus Latinis*, placuerunt." He then quotes a cloud of the fathers, even the most recent, S. Thomas Aquinas, S. Bonaventure, &c. and he goes on thus---"Quapropter S.
"Hieronymi sententia *Universæ Ecclesiæ Latinæ acceptissi-*
"*ma fuit, et immerito a multis Theologis cum gravi Censura*
"*repudiata. Imprudentes!* cum S. Hieronymo *universam*
"*prope, Ecclesiam condemnarunt.*" Ib. p. 33. n. 19. Again--
" "Et antiquis scholasticis eorumque Principibus *communis-*
"*sima est Sententia*, Episcopatum characterem non imprimere,
"nec esse ordinem, seu Sacramentum a Sacerdotio distinctum.
"Quidquid Sacramenti et characteris habet, illud a *Sacerdo-*
"*tio* haurire." Ib. p. 26. n. 5.

I utterly deny this imputation—I call it a vile calumny, calculated to injure my character; I even call it an *Episcopal* calumny, because it is *falsely* imputed to me by Dr. Milner, a *Vicar Apostolic*, who *knows well* that in this he is guilty of *falsehood*. I defy him to allege a *single passage* from any of my works, that can justify such an accusation; and I further declare, that having so calumniated me, he can never be absolved before God, until he retracts this calumny,—“*non dimittetur peccatum donec restitatur ablatum.*” He who censures unjustly, and declares us *Schismatics*, without cause, becomes himself a *Schismatic*, unless he retract.

3. “Well but Dr. O’C. denies Episcopal “jurisdiction *jure Divino* above Priests.”

I am extremely sorry to be compelled to take notice of the *ignorance* or the *knavery* of those who have charged me with heresy, schism, or scandal of any kind on this subject. I will satisfy any man of common equity and understanding, that I have not said a word on *Episcopal Jurisdiction*, but what has been already said by hundreds of Catholic Divines, and

either tacitly or expressly admitted by the Council of Trent.

There are some questions, in the examination of which, it has pleased providence to leave parts of the whole involved in an obscurity, which is calculated to exercise different capacities, and different gradations of mind. Some of these questions remain yet undecided, even in the bosom of the Catholic Church; others are sufficiently clear to admit of no dispute as to themselves, but yet to leave some of the consequences, which flow from them, open to fair argument, and honourable and charitable inquiry. Such questions may occur in the course of this discussion. Now I solemnly promise that, when they do, I shall rather inquire than dogmatize, I shall seek rather to inform than to condemn. My opposition to those who may happen to differ from me on *such* questions shall be liberal, I shall make due allowances for the portion of understanding which belongs to the brains of a *Plowden* or of a *Clinch*; and in this plain way of proceeding, suited to every capacity, even

38 *True idea of Episcopal jurisdiction.*

to that of a vulgar Bœotian, I shall leave it to my countrymen to judge for themselves.

One of the questions mooted in the Council of Trent was, whether Bishops derive jurisdiction from God or from the Pope. The French and Spanish Fathers contended for the former, the Italians, the Pope's creatures, for the latter. The controversy was carried to the utmost degree of theological malice and intemperance. The indecency with which the Italian Courtiers, headed by the General of the Jesuites *Lainez*, reviled their opponents, was such that modesty and decorum forbid my using their words; for these words, I indignantly refer to *Cardinal Palavicini's* history, l. 18, c. 15.* The Roman Court party being the most clamorous, the Council could come to no better resolution, under existing circumstances, than to leave that question *undefined!* †

* "*Ex Hispanica scabie decidimus in morbum Gallicum.*"

† "Demum, agente Cardinale Lotharingio, Canones septimus et octavus, sub ea promulgati sunt forma, qua nunc habentur, seposita scilicet illa quæstione, de qua *variabant Catholicorum sententiæ*, an Episcoporum auctoritas et jurisdictionis *esset Divini*, Hæreticorum errores *duntaxat*

For my part I perfectly agree with the French and Spanish Fathers—but with what face can a *sworn Delegate* of the Roman See fulminate censures against Columbanus, even if he had maintained that Bishops have not *jure Divino* jurisdiction over Priests, he being, in his quality of a *Roman Courtier*, *bound to know*,

“damnati sunt, asserentium Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores,” &c. Natal. Alex. Hist. Sæc. xvi. Dissert. 12, Tom. 7, p. 634.—Pope Benedict xiv, with whose works Vicars Apostolic ought to be better acquainted, says, in his De Synodo, l. 1. c. 4. “*Quæstio est inter Tridentinos Patres summa contentione jamdiu exagitata, nec definita, de qua Card. Pallavicinus in Hist. Concilii Trid. l. 18, c. 14, et l. 21, c. 11, et 13, an Episcopi illam accipiant immediate a Christo aut potius a S. Pontifice?—Here he undertakes to prove that Episcopal jurisdiction is not of Divine, but of Papal institution; and this is Roman Court Maxim to this day! “Licet eorum opinio qui hanc potestatem immediate a Christo oriri propugnant, validis fulciatur argumentis, nihilominus tamen Ratio Monarchici Regiminis, quod Christus in sua Ecclesia constituit, videtur exposcere ut totius Ecclesiæ jurisdictionis fons et origo resideat in Romano Pontifice, a quo profluet in cætera membra.” Ibid.*

This, perhaps the most formidable doctrine of the Court of Rome, is the doctrine, which every Vicar Apostolic, and every Bishop, who takes the Papal oath of allegiance, is obliged to maintain at Maynooth!—*Universal Monarchy* is its object, Religion its mantle, and *holy obedience* its word of command!

40 *True idea of Episcopal jurisdiction.*

and to teach, that Bishops hold their Sees, as he does, not *jure Divino*, but *jure Papali*, and *Apostolicæ sedis gratia*?

The truth is, that his reason for censuring *Columbanus*, is not owing to any *Heretical* or *Schismatical* doctrine, as he pretends, but because I have dared to expose the *abuses* of Episcopal authority, to challenge the infamous assertion that censures *ad Libitum*, and *unjust* excommunications, form an integral part of the discipline of Catholicity; to point out to the whole world, those private machinations, by which the Bishops *appoint their own Successors*, and claim the *exclusive* power of deciding despotically on *all matters* relating to the Church. *

4. What then, it may be asked, is Columba-

* I have called upon Dr. Poynter to produce the Instrument of his Canonical Institution, without which he is disqualified from censuring; and *he has declined the Challenge*.

Our Bishops assert, that they "*are precluded any intercourse with the Pope*," 5th Résol. of the Bishops of Dublin, Nov. 18, 1812. Now the late Pope, addressed a *Brief* to the Catholics of Britany, to warn them against *Guillot de Folleville*, styling himself *Bishop of Agra and Vicar Apostolic*. See Pius VIth's *two Letters* to the late Bishop of Leon, Rome, Sept. 2, 1793, pag. 13. *The Reader may draw the inference.*

nus's Doctrine, with respect to Episcopal jurisdiction, since it appears, from Dr. Poynter's own *written and printed* assertion, that "*Columbanus's* doctrines are not *easily ascertained?*"

Countrymen—nothing can be more easily ascertained. My Doctrine is that of S. Jerom and Chrysostom; that the *exclusive* difference between Priests and Bishops *jure Divino* consists solely in the power of ordaining; that neither has any jurisdiction whatever, until he derives Mission from the Church; that, in this respect, both *are equal*, both having *aptitude* for jurisdiction, each in his own degree; that Priests may administer the Sacrament of Confirmation by Mission from the Church, but not ordination; that with respect to the consecration of the Eucharist, the Priest's power *is as great*, and that too, by *Divine right*, as the Pope's;* that as soon as jurisdic-

* "*Potestas quæ Ordinis dicitur auferri, abdicarique nequit; et eadem est in omnibus, qui ejus participes sunt. Itaque tanta est in Sacerdote quovis simplici consecrandi corporis Dominici potestas, quanta in Episcopo, ipsoque adeo Summo Pontifice.*" Petavius ib. l. 3, c. 13, p. ix.

With regard to the disputed questions on the power of

tion is deriyed from the Church by Mission, it is not of Papal tight, as the Roman Courtiers pretend, but *jure Divino*; and yet, that I would not excommunicate the Papaline Courtiers for maintaining their position, however adulatory, though it is repugnant to Scripture; * but I would indict them for holding such *dangerous doctrines*; for aiming at *temporal dominion*; for teaching, as *articles of faith*, maxims which, under cover of religion, would establish *universal Monarchy and Despotism* in the world!

5. The Parish Priest's jurisdiction is subordinate to the Bishop's. True!—but not *so* subordinate

Jurisdiction, I refer to John Gerson Chancellor of the University of Paris's book, *De potestate Ecclesiastica*, on one side, and Jacobus Almainus *De Auctoritate Ecclesiæ* on the other; and I confine myself simply to those points which have been defined as *Articles of faith*.

* The learned Petavius observes, that it is a disputed question amongst Catholics, which may be maintained either way, *Salva fide*, whether Bishops are or are not *jure Divino* Bishops of their respective Sees; and he gives his own opinion, with evident apprehension of the vengeance of the Roman Court—"Episcopos Divino jure Prepositos Ecclesiæ arbitror, saltem *in commune ac generatim*, de quo scio quæstionem agitari inter Theologos." *De Divina Hierarc.* l. 2, c. 5, n. 12, pag. 756.

as to be subject to his *arbitrary will*; for the Government of the Church is not *absolute Monarchy*; it is tempered by Canonical Rules; and therefore no sentence can be arbitrarily pronounced, at the *mere will* of a Bishop, but every Episcopal act, whether in or out of Synod, derives its validity from the Laws of the Church.

No man in the care of souls can be dispossessed of that care, but by a Canonical sentence; and if he is so dispossessed, the Bishop who dispossesses him, even though he were the Pope, as S. Cyprian expressly declares, is guilty of a *Schismatical* act. I refer, for my proofs, to the preceding numbers of this work.

Is there any thing heretical in all this? No—it is not heresy or schism that has excited the *zeal* of the Bishops; they would be *glad* to be able to make good these imputations, and they have shrunk from the challenge. They cannot, in fact, condemn my doctrines, without condemning all those Catholic authors whom I quote.

* “Itaque Sacerdos simplex, cum initiatur, non modo *ordinis* potestatem, sed *jurisdictionis* etiam accipit.” Mel-

Petavius bestows a whole chapter in proving, that S. Jerom's words on this subject cannot be explained in an orthodox sense, otherwise than by admitting, that the whole power of *external jurisdiction* is, by divine institution, *equal in Priests and Bishops*; and this is more than I have ever advanced on that subject; *

chior Canus de Pœnit. parte v. p. 393; and again, "Simplex Sacerdos ab ordinatione sua habet potestatem absolvendi, sed quia deest illi materia circa quam possit exercere, idcirco non absolvit. p. 417. ed. Bassan. 1776."

* S. Jerom's words are—"Bishops ought to know that they are rather by usage, than by Divine Institution greater than Priests, and that they ought to govern the Church *in common* with Priests." *Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate, Presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere Ecclesiam regere.*"

Petavius's argument is in these words—"S. Jerom says, that Priests and Bishops are equal by Divine institution, but he means not to say so with reference to the power of ordaining, but only with reference to *external jurisdiction*. He had read in the Scriptures, that Bishops and Priests are promiscuously so called, and that both governed the Church in common; as in the Acts c. xx, and he *rightly* and *justly* inferred, that Priests and Bishops are equal, with respect to the external power and jurisdiction of governing the Church *in common*; but he never meant, that they are equal as to the power of ordination; for he expressly states the reverse, in his 85th Epistle," &c.

"Legabat apud Apostolum S. Doctor Episcopos et Pres-

so that in censuring me, the Vicars have more than censured S. Jerom, and the whole Catholic

byteros promiscue nuncupari; tum ab iisdem numero pluribus in commune regi *Ecclesiam Dei*; (Act xx) utroque porro nomine designari ab illo Pastores et Præsides Ecclesiæ. Quare id quod erat consequens ex ea conclusit, eosdem olim Presbyteros et Episcopos fuisse, quod ad officium et gubernandi potestatem attinet, non autem ordine ac caractere, et interiori potestate, quam in Episcopo diversam ac multo sublimiorem agnovit. Non enim, ut Salmasius putat, Presbyteros, quos cum Episcopis confert, Episcopali ordinatione præditos fuisse voluit; immo hanc nominatim excipit in Epistola 85. *Restat igitur ut solam in utrisque jurisdictionem, et externam administrationem respexerit.* Petav. de Divina Hierar. l. 2, c. v. n. iv. t. 3. p. 752. And again—"Noune Sole ipso clarius lucet, Presbyteros ab Hieronymo censi, ordine quidem et caractere ab Episcopis distinctos, *gubernandi vero et administrandi munere* his illos exæquari" ib. n. v. Again---Principio quidem, sub Apostolis Ecclesiam in commune administrasse putat Episcopos et Presbyteros; hoc est utriusque ordinis Sacerdotes, primi ac secundi, qui, communi vocabulo, a cura, inspectione, et administratione Ecclesiæ, nuncupati sunt Episcopi simul et Presbyteri; adeo ut ordinatione, gradu, et Sacerdotii genere distarent. Cujus discriminis caput in eo constituit, quod in eadem Epistola nominatim excipit, nempe in *ordinandi potestate* "Quid enim facit--inquit--*excepta ordinatione*, Episcopus, quod non faciat Presbyter." Hoc itaque seposito, reliquæ partes Episcopatus cum Presbytero communicatæ sunt, ut putavit Hieronymus. Quanquam illud videri potest *καταύξασιν*, ut multa alia dixisse: cum pleraque alia functionis Episcopalis nunquam a Presbyteris usurpata legantur.

46 *True idea of Episcopal jurisdiction.*

Church, for twelve centuries, from the days of S. Jerom to our own !

I am charged indeed, with having refuted Dr. *Castabala's* assertion, that Bishops *exclusively* can administer confirmation, as well as ordination ; but I repeat my assertions on that subject. If he was ignorant until *Columbanus* taught him the Christian doctrine, he has to censure no one but himself. If, instead of dealing in 'libels, and absurdity, he will read the books to which I have referred him, and *Natalis Alexander*, Sæc. 2, dissert. x, t. 3, p. 435, 444, &c. he will learn what he ought to have known, before he undertook to scribble. May he *unlearn* that profligacy of assertion, that

tur. Sed quod præcipuum est illius ordinis, *Ecclesiæ gubernatio, Legum, Decretorumque sanctio, Sacramentorum administratio*, quæ in usu erant quotidiano, et ordinatione, ut jam docuimus, excepta, *Scelerum coercitio*, et ob ea *pœnarum inflictio*, ut *excommunicationis et rejectionis ab Ecclesiæ aditu*, et similium, hæc inquam, et alia complura, quibus Disciplina Christianæ communitatis ac Reipublicæ continetur, *Presbyterorum collegium curasse*, ac totius Ecclesiæ rectionem habuisse Hieronymus arbitratus est, ita ut nemo tum *unus* suoapte nomine et auctoritate illa præstaret, sed *in commune omnia*, deque totius Collegii sententia. Ib. n. vi.

turpitude of calumny, and that indecency of abuse, which he ought to have endeavoured, against the brutality of nature, to subdue, were it only, for the *political purpose* of sacrificing those darling propensities, to the gravity of the Episcopal character, and to his boasted attachment to the *Holy See*!—But—“*Naturam expellas furca licet, usque recurret.*”

Sandini himself confesses, that Gregory the great allowed the Sardinian Clergy, of the second order, to adhere to the usage of their national Church, by administering confirmation. I have already quoted his own words on this subject, from his last Epistle 26, l. 4. Two Councils which Castabala will not deny to be Œcumenical, maintain his orthodoxy in that respect. The Florentine, in its Decree of Union with the Armenians, and that of Trent in its 7th Sess. can. 3. This same doctrine is taught by Baronius, an. 594, § 15, by Bellarmine de Rom. Pont. l. 4, c. 10, by S. Thomas Aquinas, part 3, q. 72, art. 11, by Natal. Alex. sæc. 2, dissert. 10, § 14 and 21, and by the Maurine

editors of the Epistles of Pope Gregory the great; * and I differ not an iota from them.

6. “Oh!—but Columbanus maintains Arianism, in some respects, *presumptuously dictating* to the *learned* Bishops of his native country, tenets subversive of their Religion.”

Countrymen—it is far from my object to draw your attention, either to the ignorance, or to the misrepresentations of Bishops. Extremely painful it is to expose the former, and nothing short of the *necessity of self-defence*, could induce me to inflict the unwilling lash of calumniated orthodoxy on the latter. My first object, that nearest to my heart, as well as to

* That prodigy of learning, Petavius, says of S. J. Chrysostom—“*Solo jure ordinandi separari adstruit Episcopum a Presbytero. Nam et Presbyteri docendi suscepere munus, et Ecclesiæ Præfecturam, ac quæcumque de Episcopis dixit Paulus, eadem et Presbyteris conveniunt. Sola enim impositione manuum superiores sunt Episcopi, et hoc uno videntur excellere Presbyteros.*” Chrysost. Hom. 2 in 1. ad Tim. c. 3, p. 289, apud Petav. Hierarc. l. 2, c. 4, n. 3, p. 747. Again—“*Ostendimus S. Chrysostomi mentem fuisse Episcopos a Paulo memoratos in Ep. ad Philip. Secundi ordinis Sacerdotes fuisse.*” Ib. c. 3, n. 1, p. 742.

the most enlightened amongst you, is to shew the necessity of establishing a *National Catholic Church*, the *discipline* of which, shall not be in direct hostility to the spirit, and in direct violation of the elementary principles of our Constitution. For this purpose it is, that I wish to state to you clearly, what are the genuine principles of our Church Government, in opposition to the arbitrary *Bellarminism*, which the Bishops wish to fix upon us, in support of their *pretended Spiritual* power; I wish to strip theology of its Legerdemain; to explain its technical obscurity; and to reduce it to the standard of common sense.

It ever will be the object of the designing, to involve their plans in obscurity, because obscurity always has a tendency to create awe. Objects, are darkened when a veil of apprehension and terror is thrown round them, to prevent our approach; whilst the great and discriminating feature of truth, as opposed to error, is that it *challenges investigation*.

6. There are three opinions to be distinguished, with respect to the superiority of the Episcopal

50 *Three Opinions—Policy of the Vicars, &c.*

over the second order of the Clergy. The *first* is that of *Aerius*, who admitted no difference, even with respect to the power of ordination; this is that *heresy*, which the Dr. of Castabala so religiously imputes to me; betraying thereby, either his utter ignorance of the meaning of Arianism, or his atrocious knavery in imputing it!—The *second* is that of some Scholastics, who admitted the superiority of Bishops, but said, that it was not of Divine, or of Apostolical institution, but introduced, in after ages, by the Christian Church, to prevent Schisms.—I have no where maintained even this opinion. No—no where.—I defy any man to shew, that I have; and even if I had, I should not therefore be deemed a schismatic or a heretic.—Our Bishops fancy, that this second opinion was condemned by the Council of Trent; but in supposing this, they only betray their own ignorance; they are egregiously deceived!—The *third* opinion, that which I have maintained, that which I now repeat is, that although Bishops are, by *divine institution*, superior to Priests, with respect to

the ordaining power; they are not *exclusively* so *jure Divino*, with respect to any other power whatsoever.—I repeat this doctrine now; I throw down the gauntlet; let who will take it up.—I maintain, that every other power, which is exercised by a Bishop, except that of ordination *alone*, even that of *consecrating the chrism*, and of *confirming*, may be exercised by simple Presbyters, by mission from the Church.

Again, and again, I bid defiance to the proof of heterodoxy, not only with respect to this doctrine, but with respect to any other I have advanced, in any of my writings; and then it will follow, that those Bishops who have attempted to raise a Religious cry against me, *calumniating my orthodoxy*, have incurred the guilt of those who, most iniquitously, excommunicated Walsh, Harold, Clanricard, &c. in the days of *Rinuccini*. *

* See the note above, page 24, note †.

Baronius asserts, that the Popes never submitted to the Imperial edicts, which enjoin the confirmation of their election, by an Imperial decree. But this impudent falsehood is refuted by Balluzius, in his learned edition of the *Capitularies*, from p. 18 to p. 20 of his preface; and in his ex-

Have I now explained myself fairly, fully, and above board? Will our *very learned* Vicars and Bishops, take upon themselves to condemn

cellent notes on Agobard. Compare Pope Leo IVth's solemn protest, addressed to the Emperor Lotharius in *Ivo*, part 4, c. 176, Panorm. c. 149, Gratian Dist. x, c. 9.

When Pope Leo died, and Benedict III. was elected, the Clergy and Gentry of Rome deputed Agents to Lotharius and Lewis, petitioning for the confirmation of the *Decretum* electionis which they had signed, nor could he be consecrated until a favourable answer was received by Imperial Decree.

The Vatican Bibliothecarian Anastasius mentions this as the ancient established Discipline of the Holy See. "Electio, *consuetudo prisca* ut poscit, Lothario et Ludovico missa per Delgatos," &c. This Discipline was observed even in the election of Pope Hildebrand or Gregory VII. of whom even Sandini says—"Hic statim misit ad Henricum Regem Legatos de electione sua, quam *ille approbavit*; legavitque Romam Gregorium Episcopum Vercellensem qui adesset consecrationi ejus." The following observation on the *Decretum* electionis Gregorii VII. which may be seen in *Labbe's Councils* t. x, is extracted from Angelus de Nuce's Annotations on the Chronicle of Monte Casino l. 4, c. 2, in Muratori's *Scriptores Italici* t. 4, p. 491. "Gregorius VII, a *solo clero Romano*, præsenti-
tibus tamen Episcopis et Abbatibus, eligitur." He then gives the decree, and concludes—"Clerus ergo Romanus, ad quem spectabat electio, Presbyteros, et Diaconos tantum Cardinales cum inferioribus ordinibus complectebatur, non Episcopos." After this, I leave the pretensions of the Irish Bishops to exclusive power in the Church, to the serious consideration of my countrymen.

this opinion? * Certainly, they will try if they can—for in their *private* meetings of Dublin, Feb. 26, 1810, and Nov. 11, 1812, they have the modesty to claim *exclusive* right to decide on *all matters*, even of discipline, relating to the Irish Church; a claim to an *Imperium in Imperio*, which clashes with the independence of all Governments, of Catholic as well as Protestant States! If they have compromised their characters, by advancing ambitious and insupportable claims, they have to blame, not me, who feel myself bound to expose their

* Tertia sententia est Episcopum Presbytero *jure Divino* majorem esse, imo Presbyterum *jure Divino* subditum esse Episcopo. Hanc doctrinam concilium evidenter tradit, *non ita tamen evidenter*, ut qui *Adam* sententiam amplexus fuerit, hæreseos accusari possit. Sic Sess. 23, canone 4---“ Si quis dixerit Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi, vel eam quam habent illis esse cum Presbyteris communem, Anathema sit. Clarum est Episcopos Presbyteris esse *superiores*, et contrariam sententiam esse hæresim. An vero Primatus ille sit *juris Divini* an Ecclesiastici, non est ita evidens.” Ib. p. 34, c. 3, n. 3. After this, I leave it the world to judge, who is guilty of misrepresenting the Catholic Doctrines, the Bishops who claim *exclusive jurisdiction* *jure Divino*, to decide on *all matters* touching faith and discipline, or Columbanus.

54 *Papal Bulls—Maynooth Education.*

designs; but they have to blame themselves, for daring to introduce despotism into the Church, and to throw their arrogant claims in the way, as a stumbling block to the Emancipation of their country; as if the Catholic Religion, which ministers to the welfare of mankind, in a future world, were to be instrumental only, to our degradation and ruin in this!

§ V. *Dangerous attempt to enforce the Bull Unigenitus—Policy of that attempt.—Plan to stultify the People of Ireland, by the Maynooth system of Education.*

1. The Catholic Religion is known not only to exist, but even to flourish, as far as its *real* object, the sanctification of the soul extends, under every form of Government, from the arctic to the antarctic regions, from the snows of Torneo to Cape Horn, from China to Peru. Perhaps one of the most prominent as well as honourable features of that system is, that whenever abandoned to its native energies, its sacraments, unalloyed by human ambition, it

has ever introduced courtesy, even amongst despots; it has tempered their cruelty, by an infusion of benevolence; it has delayed the precipitate sentence of blood; where it could not entirely avert the blow; and after causing shame to come in aid of conscience, it has restrained the intemperate proceedings of the most relentless and ungodly administrations.

In order the more effectually to succeed in humanizing mankind, it will be found, that our Irish ancestors, who introduced the blessings of Christianity amongst the Northumbrian and Bernician Saxons, the Burgundians, the Franks, and the Swiss, endeavoured to employ the minds of those savage nations on the liberal arts; letters accompanied their progress; the perusal of the Holy Scriptures, the transcribing of manuscripts, the decoration of churches, the illumination of books, the invention of various colours for painting, all those amusements which might best contribute to wane the minds of barbarians from the din of arms, and the ferocious manners of savage life, all were cultivated with diligence, and rendered fashionable and endearing by religion.

Learning and Religion travelled thus with our *Aidans*, our *Columbas*, and our *Columbans*, arm in arm; and charity, humanity, and civilization followed in their train.

It is only when the professors of Catholicity arrogate to themselves political command, under the mask of Religion, that an attempt is made by them to extinguish the lamp of learning, to introduce the servitude of *blind* compliance, and by the help of *Bulls*, which enjoin obedience to *unjust* censures, to establish ignorance and *political Popery*, by which the energies of men may be shackled, though their minds may never be convinced!—Then, whatever reading it recommends, is not only mixed up with the fabulous, but it is interlarded with *that species* of fabulous, which is best calculated to degrade the understanding, and to substitute the vilest credulity, the most abject oriental servitude and subserviency of mind, for the manly energies, and the fortitude of religion. *

* One of the tales of the Roman breviary, which I have read in the office of this day, the 6th of November, informs me, that S. *Nicholas* was a pious faster, even from his birth;

2. There is no man, ever so willing to be deceived, who, if he will but compare the late Resolutions of the Irish Bishops, assembled in Dublin, Feb. 26, 1810, and Nov. 18, 1812, will not perceive, that their spleen to *Columbanus*, originates in his exposing their claim to *exclusive* dominion, their Resolution to exclude the second order of the Clergy from our National Synods, to *decide on all matters* relating to the Church, to inculcate *blind* obedience, and to establish the doctrine of *censures ad libitum*, by which all resistance to any *Test Act* they may introduce, or any discipline they may propose, must be ineffectual, so that every mandate of theirs must be *implicitly* obeyed!

I have always thought, not only that the cause of Religion is never promoted by this barbarizing and despotic system, but that the best subordination, the most religious, and the most durable, is not that which origi-

for, on Wednesdays and Fridays, he abstained from his mother's milk. With a spirit of holiness, worthy the imitation of all the Students of *Maynooth*, he turned his little pious lips from the profane spring of maternal nourishment; and, surely, how can any pious *Maynoothian* complain, if he fares on Wednesdays and Fridays, not more sumptuously than S. Nicholas?

58. *Papal Bulls—Maynooth Education.*

nates in oriental servility, and coercion, but that which arises from a clear knowledge of our duties, and of their extent, from a regular administration of equitable laws, from a conviction of rational injunctions, from the consequent obligation of rational obedience, from decorous manners, and cultivated minds.

Men cheerfully submit, as long as the relative duties of superiors are not violated; nor the limits of just obedience levelled, by arbitrary power.—They know, that in all power, there is a tendency to despotism, except in that Almighty fiat, which regulates by pure and unerring laws, the wonderful mechanism of the universe. Who can be so silly as to suppose, that the second order of the Irish Clergy, will dare to object to any proceedings or innovations of the Bishops, as long as they are overawed by censures, and menaced with deposition, excluded from their places in the second order of the Hierarchy, and degraded from their rank in our National Church? *

3. For the purpose of more effectually estab-

* See Joannis Filesaci Theologi Parisiensis de Parœciarum origine, c. 4, p. 60, &c. and Le Gros de Ecclesia.

lishing, this barbarizing and despotic system of Church Government, Dr. P. has called upon me officially, in his capacity of *Delegate from the Holy See*, and in the awful name of my Maker, and in an authoritative style of menace, to subscribe the *Bull Unigenitus!** Now, the 95th proposition, condemned by that Bull, is pregnant with such awful consequences, that I feel called upon by my *oath of allegiance*, solemnly to submit it to the attention of all Ireland.—It is in the following words:—

“The fear of an *unjust* excommunication, ought not to prevent our *doing our duty*.”

I hold this proposition, which I am thus called upon, in the name of God, to condemn, not

* Dr. Poynter's words are thus officially and authoritatively addressed:—“As in your *Historical Address*, page 23, “you exclaim, that no foreign influenced Bishop, dares to “condemn the Bull *Unigenitus*, I call upon you to inform me, “1st, Whether you condemn the Bull *Unigenitus*? 2d, Whether “you accept the same?—From your language concerning the “Council of Trent, p. 126, of your *Historical Address*, I am “led to *doubt*, whether you submit, in *any sense*, to the authority of that Council, with respect either to its *definitions of doctrine*, or to *any* of its Canons of discipline? and moreover, whether you submit to the authority of *any General Council* of the Catholic Church, with respect to its definitions of doctrine?” Dr. Poynter's letter of June 9th, 1812.

only to be true, but I hold its opposite to be subversive of civil government, and destructive of the moral sense. If an *unjust* excommunication, is to prevent Catholics from *doing their duty*, for what purpose tender an oath of allegiance? Cases may occur, as in the days of the gunpowder plot, of *Rinuccini*, *Airoidi*, and *Ghilini*, when *holy men* may inform the common Irish, and that too in the Tribunal of Confession, that an *unjust* excommunication ought to be obeyed, rather than the oath of allegiance; that there may be cases in which it ought to prevent their revealing a murder, or a conspiracy against the State. *

* Some of those who would enforce this *political Bull*, maintain the Pope's personal infallibility. See Mr. Plowden's book, entitled "Considerations on the *modern* opinion of the *fallibility* of the Holy See." Lond. 1791.

Not only do they derive their faculties under the *Court* of Rome; but they actually enjoy annuities from that Court. See Throckmorton's letter on the appointment of Bishops. Lond. 1791, pag. 28.

Lainez, the 2d general of the Jesuites, laid it down as a rule of his order, that they should ever maintain the Papal maxims, exactly as they found them in his time; assuming the name of *Singleton*, he wrote in favour of the *deposing power*, against Preston, who assumed the name of Withrington; he

4. Be it remembered, that there are two views of Popery. Popery is not only a system of Religion; it is also a deep laid *system of policy*, which has availed itself of the experience of ages; of many successes, and of many reverses of fortune; of the various experiments in policy, which have led to the one, and of many mistakes, which have led to the other. In its objectionable point of view, it may perhaps be accurately defined in these words:—"An *undue* adherence to the Pope, as temporal head of the Church, in *Courtly* maxims, and political principles, which are falsely pretended to be Catholic Religion."—If I should be asked, what those temporal maxims are, I will not now refer to *Bellarmino*, because some of our Bishops affect to despise him; neither shall I refer to any of the numerous *Papaline* sycophants of the last century. No—not even

wrote against the oath of *mere civil allegiance* to James I. as *Bellarmino* did; because James was a heretic; and the English Jesuites supported him, in their Three Treatises, intitled the *Loyalty of the Jesuites* against the defenders of James's oath, and the Irish Remonstrance; published in 1667.

to Plowden's defence of the Pope's personal infallibility, published in London, so lately as 1791!—All this might be deemed an unfair advantage, and not applicable to the Bishops or Vicars Apostolic of the present day. I therefore confine myself to the Pamphlets and Resolutions, published by those Bishops, within the last three years; to Dr. Poynter's *new Test*; to the doctrine of *unjust* excommunications, *arbitrary* censures, depositions without trials; to the above proposition, page 59, and to these following, which Dr. P. calls upon me *officially* to condemn, by an unqualified reception of the *Bull Unigenitus*.

79. "It is useful and necessary, at all times, in all places, "and to all sorts of people, to study and to know the Spirit, "and the Mysteries of the holy Scriptures."

80. "The reading of the holy Scriptures is meant for all.*

* This is the 80th proposition, the condemnation of which, by this *political Bull*, caused tumults, and insurrections, throughout the whole kingdom of France, until that Bull was finally suppressed by the civil power. *Memoirs de Louis XIV. t. 7. and Histoire de la Constit. Unig.* The subsequent propositions which Dr. P. calls upon me to condemn, are all obviously Catholic; nor is it easy, even by torture, to give them any other meaning, than such as no *sincere* Catholic can pos-

81. "The holy obscurity of the word of God is not a sufficient reason for the Laity to hold themselves dispensed from reading the Scriptures."

82. "Christians ought to sanctify the Sunday, by reading pious books; and, above all, the Holy Scriptures. It is dangerous to neglect this duty, or to secede from it."

51. "Faith justifies, when it operates; but it operates only by charity."

53. "It is charity alone, that performs in a Christian manner, Christian Acts, with relation to God and J.C."

55. "God crowns only charity. He runs in vain, who runs by any other movement, or from any other motive."

60. "If the fear of punishment *alone*, animates repentance, the more violent that fear is, the more it leads to despair."

61. "Fear arrests only the hand, the heart remains attached to sin, whilst it is not governed by the love of justice."

62. "He who does not abstain from evil, except from *fear of punishment*, commits evil in his heart, and is criminal in the sight of God."

sibly reject. They are not only orthodox, but they are so intimately connected with Christian morality, that they are held in common, by Protestants and Catholics, and by every Christian sect, as essentials of Christianity! So true it is, that Political Bishops and Court Sycophants, will sophisticate themselves and their flocks, out of Christianity, from a spirit of subservient adulation and intrigue.—"Hæc omnia tibi dabo, si cadens adoraveris me!"

Sir J. Throckmorton observes, Let. 2, page 109, that "the Court of Rome, by means of its usurped power, made the most essential interests of Religion subservient to its political designs."

64 *Papal Bulls—Maynooth Education.*

69. "Faith, the exercise of faith, its encrease and its recompence, all are gifts of the pure mercy and bounty of God."

Here then am I justified in asserting, that the object of the Vicars and Bishops, in censuring *Columbanus*, is not the preservation of the Catholic Religion, but of their own extravagant power, of *political Popery*, and of unlimited and uncontrollable dominion *in all matters* relating to the Catholic Church; as if there were no other order in the Hierarchy, than their own; as if the second order was to be their slaves, rather than *assessors*; as if *all power*, and the plenitude of all power, were *exclusively* vested in themselves!

5. One of the most detestable consequences of this system is, that it establishes in minds which are naturally ingenuous, a vile servility, a low cunning, a despicable spirit of intriguing, and a falsehood in conversation and manner, which abject dependence always inspires. He, who cannot nobly throw off his servitude, will ignobly endeavour, like one of the slaves of a Turkish Seraglio, to soften that servitude, by intriguing for command over some other slave,

as contemptible as himself; he will, therefore, flatter those whom he despises. Professing attachment, where he feels abhorrence, and disguising his real sentiments, even where he is convinced of the truth, he will give the name of prudence to the most detestable duplicity; then insincerity and falsehood, *low* cunning, and treachery, will become leading features of his character; and then, it will be inferred, that such is the character of his nation! Yes, the *nature* of Irishmen will be reproached, with the contaminations which will thus be connected with their *Religion*; whilst the truth is, that both their nature and their Religion will be corrupted, degraded, and debased by the *barbarizing system* of abject servility, blind ignominious obedience, *exclusive domination* in *all matters* relating to the Church, which the first order of the Hierarchy are thus endeavouring to establish, instead of Christian obedience, on the necks of our countrymen! *

* When the Primitive Bishops wrote Pastoral Letters, they wrote in *the name and on behalf of their respective Churches*. The words *motu proprio* were unknown. S. Clement writ-

6. I know, that in the present state of my native country, all truths tending to cement the connection between the sister islands, will be decried, by a faction of pettyfogging barristers

ing to the Corinthians, addresses his Letter thus:—"The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God which is at Corinth." "Dei Ecclesiæ quæ Romæ diversatur, Dei Ecclesiæ quæ Corinthi habitat."

Eusebius gives many instances, as "Ecclesia Dei quæ est Smirnæ Ecclesiæ Dei apud Philomelium." Hist. Eccl. l. 4, and again l. 5, c. 1, et c. 24.

S. Chrysostom speaking of the Government, even of the Apostles, who were gifted with miracles and languages, says that they issued no edicts, they did nothing of their own private opinion, or *motu proprio*, but by *common agreement*. In order to impress this doctrine more strongly on the minds of Bishops, he proves, that this conduct was uniformly observed, even by S. Peter, "De communi sententia omnia facit, nihil privata auctoritate, nihil pro Imperio, &c. Sic etiam fieri nunc oportebat." Was this *Secret-Synodizing*?

Tertullian proclaims the same mode of Government still more forcibly, de Idol. c. 18. and S. Isidore is still stronger. "The Bishop's power, says he, is a Ministry of Charity, common to the subordinate Clergy; and not an *Empire*. It is not a tyrannical despotism, which acts as it wills, but a ministry which is *responsible to the laws of the Church*. "Ministerium, non Imperium, in quod inquiri nequaquam debeat; Pater-nam procuracionem, non tyrannicam pro arbitrio vivendi licentiam; Dispensatoriam Præfecturam; non potestatem minime reddendis rationibus obnoxiam," l. 3. Ep. 126. Compare the first Council of Jerusalem, Acts xv, and xxi.

and foreign-influenced theologastres, who are interested in the cheat; but I feel within me, a generous contempt of their proceedings, an admiration of solid patriotism, a detestation of every species of intrigue, and a love of truth. I perceive also, that whatever advantages my opponents may derive from a *Religious cry*, that advantage will be but the feverish frenzy of a season; for I shall have the advantage of a *better cause*, whilst the *Rinuccini Vicars*, and the *Aulici Romani*, the *sworn delegates* of the Court of Rome, have most improvidently chosen a ground on which they cannot stand, without stumbling; they cannot retreat, without shame; and they cannot advance, without disgrace.

7. Nor are the evils of this barbarizing system, confined to that of degrading the minds of our youth, and corrupting them by servility and intrigue. Alas! it renders them the fittest tools for a despotic revolution, not only against the State, but also against the *dearest liberties* of their country, and their Religion!

Lord Clarendon has justly observed, that it is *absolutely necessary to ascertain, what the*

*authority is, that a foreign Prince or Potentate, doth challenge in these islands, contrary to, or above the laws of the land; and what obedience it is, that subjects may pay to a foreigner, without the privity, or contrary to the command of his own Sovereign. Nor can any general answer be satisfactory. They who talk only of foreign Spiritual power, must declare, what the full extent and intent of that power is, which may otherwise be extended as far as they please; nor can the Catholic Laity be secure of their own allegiance, until they fully know, from those who entangle them with distinctions, what that Spiritual power is, and what submission they are bound to pay to it.**

8. Nothing can better illustrate this argument, than the fact, that the Bishops include in their Spiritual power, a power of enforcing the *Bull Unigenitus*, and all the Briefs and Mandates of the Holy See, as *Tests of faith or discipline*; they teach, at *Maynooth*, that they can

* Clarendon's Animadversions on a book entitled Fanaticism fanatically imputed to the Catholic Church, &c. by a person of honour.

depose any Priest, however acceptable to his flock, unless he will subscribe any new *Test Act* they may think proper to impose, and, even in unqualified terms, receive the political *discipline* of the Council of Trent, as they receive the doctrine of *Seven Sacraments*!*

They teach, that a Papal Vicar, Bishop, or Delegate may, by the plenitude of Papal power, interdict any place of worship, so as to prevent divine service there, even on Sundays, whether it be a Parish Chapel, or a family oratory; and this for *occult* reasons, known only to himself!

* See the Vicar of Castabala's words in Columbanus's *Historical Address*, part 2, pag. 113, &c.

“ A book published, *by authority*, for the use of the Students of Maynooth College, and entitled, “ *Tractatus de Ecclesia*,” concludes with these remarkable words:—“ *Itaque maximo in pretio Concilium Tridentinum habere debent omnes clerici, cum, ratione Dogmatum, tum ratione disciplinæ, merito dici possit Manuale Sacerdotum!*” &c. Those, therefore, who are educated for the Priesthood, in this kingdom, are taught to set the highest value on the discipline of the C. of Trent. Mr. Plowden, in his “ *Case stated*,” openly avowes, that the *very same tenets* are maintained by the Papists of these days which were held by their brethren of former times.” Bishop of Lincoln's charge, Lond. 1812, pag. 24.—What?—the *same tenets* for which Caron, Walsh, Preston, &c. were excommunicated! the *deposing power*! precious Catholicity!

9. Repeatedly have they declared, that they have a right to decide *exclusively* on *all matters* relating to the Church. ! Arrogant assertion ! —This was the identical principle which the Bishops urged, when they excommunicated Ormond, and Clanricard, the King's representatives, and every Catholic soldier and officer, who adhered to them, from the peace of Kilkenny to the utter extinction of the Royal cause? (*Columbanus's Hist. Address.*)

And yet the Primitive Bishops never denounced censures, but with the consent, and after the mature deliberation of the whole Church. In denouncing even the incestuous Corinthian, S. Paul expressly refers to this *universal convention*—"In the name of our Lord " J. C. *when ye are gathered together,*" &c. 1 Cor. 4. *

The proofs which I have given above, and

* The Law, Cod. Theod. l. 1, which gives to Bishops an *exclusive* power of deciding Ecclesiastical causes, is spurious. Gothofr. t. vi. Giannone Hist. of Naples, t. 1, l. 2, c. 8. Baluz's Capitularies l. vi. c. 281.—On the right of the State to appoint Deputies to preside in National Councils, see *De Marca*, *Launois*, and *Richer*.

in my *Historical Address*, that the Government of the Church is not *Monarchical*, but mixed, and *tempered by the Canons*, are innumerable. I beg leave to refer to them here.

10. The Maynooth Students are authoritatively taught, that when they become Parish Priests, they are not to be judges, either in Synods or out of Synods, of the faith, or the discipline, the catechisms, or the books, the lives of Saints, or miracles, the loyalty, or the disloyalty of the maxims which they are to deliver to their flocks; but they are to teach such doctrine only, whether it be the Bull *Unigenitus*, or in *Cæna Domini*, such *Test Acts*, such Tridentine or Lateran *discipline*, such well-worshipping miracles and maxims, as the Bishop may think proper to impose! * They are informed with

* And yet even the discipline of Trent, which gives to Bishops, as *Delegates of the Holy See*, exorbitant powers, such as never before were heard of, in its 25th Session. De invocatione SS. unites the Parish Priests with the Bishops, as Overseers of those matters. "Mandat Sancta Synodus omnibus Episcopis, et cæteris, docendi munus, curamque sustinentibus," &c.

The Scriptures mention Church authority in a very different manner from that of our Bishops. "The Kings of the

equal dogmatism of expression, and petulance of style, that the Irish nation shall not be allowed to enjoy the Canonical liberties, commonly called Gallican, because the Bishops *have so willed!*—With an arrogance of manner and language, which was unknown to our ancestors, they are expressly informed that, *in short*, the Irish Church shall not be governed by the Canon laws, but *as they please!*

The preferment of the Maynooth scholar depends upon the *holy* obedience, and the tame, and temporizing servility, with which he maintains these maxims. A certain great personage once said to our Saviour—"Look round thee—see all the kingdoms of the world—its goodly parishes, and mitres, and livings—I will give thee all these good things, if falling down, thou wilt adore me."—" *Hæc omnia tibi dabo si cadens adoraveris me!*"

11. The Maynooth Students are taught that

Gentiles exercise Lordship over them. But ye shall not be so." Luke 22, 25. Mathew 20, 25. Marc. x, 42. This injunction is given, nearly in the same words, by these three Evangelists; and it is referred to, by S. Paul, 2d Cor. i. 24, and by S. Peter i. v. 3, "Neque ut dominantes in Cleris."

the State can make no Laws for the Church; that no man or body of men, however high their station, in or out of Parliament, can meddle in Ecclesiastical matters, or touch *one fibre* of their jurisdiction;* and yet Constantine made Laws for the Church, whilst he was yet a Pagan, as already shewn. Valentinian enacted Laws to prevent an excessive number of of Clergy, and improper persons being ordained; Arcadius renewed these Laws; Justinian enacted Laws against the Patriarchs

* See *Historical Address*, Part II. p. 30. For the Laws made by Catholic States, to restrain the abuses of Episcopal power, see the subsequent pages of that work; compare Baluzius's excellent Preface to the Capitularies of the French Kings. The abuse of Ecclesiastical censures compelled Justinian to enact, Nouel. 123, that no Bishop should dare to excommunicate any, until he was first publicly tried and convicted. This Law was renewed frequently, in subsequent ages, L. 30. Basilicor. de Ep. et Cleric.---Even the Roman Cardinal Cusa admits, that the civil power may enact *Ecclesiastical* Laws, which shall be binding on the Church, with respect to the *election of Bishops, collation of benefices*, and the *regulation of public worship*. "Non decet quempiam dicere SS. Imperatores qui bono Reipublicæ in *electionibus Episcoporum* in *collationibus beneficiorum*, in *observatione Religionum* multas *sacras* Constitutiones ediderunt, ita statuere non pótuisse." &c. Conc. Cathol. l. 3, c. 40.

ordaining more than a certain number of Priests; he even enjoined, that for a certain number of years, there should be no ordinations; and that then, those who were to be ordained, should be registered, and presented for ordination by the State. *See Novel. 3 and 16. and Baluz's Capitularies.*

The Imperial edicts enacted, that no Pope should be consecrated, until his election was confirmed by the Emperors, as already shewn. Now they were not only Christian Emperors, but they were staunch Catholics who enacted these Laws; and the Patriarchs and Popes, who received them, were certainly not less learned, nor less zealous Catholics, than the Vicars Apostolic, and Bishops, of the British Islands! They knew what seems not to be known at Maynooth, that every Sovereign State is invested with power to enact Laws, which may preserve its independence, from the encroachments of an *Imperium in Imperio*, that tends to undermine its constitution, and destroy its existence. The whole 16th book of the Theodosian Code relates to Laws for the Government of the Church. The

pious, the learned, and eloquent *Cassiodorus* was the writer of that edict of Atalaricus, king of the Goths, which determined the mode of electing Bishops, by Imperial decree. *Cassiodorus*, l. 9, c. 15.

12. The Maynooth scholars are taught, that Bishops can hold *secret* Conventicles, where no person shall be present, but such *mitre-hunting* sycophants only, as they shall condescend to invite; and yet the Catholic Emperors pretended to a right of sending Deputies, to witness the proceedings of Synods, and even to order that no business should be transacted in them, but such as the Imperial edicts decreed; and especially, that no *new Tests* should be enacted without their approbation. *

* Almost all General Councils were convened by the Secular power, as is manifest from their Acts. The Emperors and their deputies attended, to take care that no discussion or decision should be introduced, which might trespass on the independance of the State. Compare Columbanus's Historical Address part 2, p. 67, &c. with De Marca Concord. Sacerd. & Imp. l. 4, c. 4, whence it appears, that the Catholic States often interposed, not only to annul the Resolutions and Decrees of Bishops, as prejudicial, but to annul them, merely as having been published without the per-

76 *Maynooth Education—Secret Meetings.*

Private Conventicles have been the unhallowed sources of those scandalous practices which, for so many years, prevailed in the Council of Trent.—To secure a majority, the Pope's Legates held *private* meetings, in which they proposed the Canons of Discipline, and sometimes even of faith, which they wished to carry, in the form and words prescribed at Rome; and it was only when a majority was secured in *private*, that these Subjects were publicly proposed. This Policy has been always practised by the sworn Delegates of that Court.

When *Rinuccini* found that he could not, in the public Assembly of Kilkenny, prevail on the Irish to concur in his measures, he held a *private* assembly of the Bishops at his house, Dec. 20th, 1645, produced to them a *Protest* against the Peace with Ormond, and, partly by threats, and partly by promises, availing himself of their sycophant subserviency, he prevailed

mission of the State. Launojus de Regia in Matrimonium potestate. Justinian Novel. 74, c. 4, Novel. 117, c. 4, where even the *ceremonies* and *impediments* of marriage are prescribed by the Civil Power. Baluz. Capit. l. 6. c. 130, 327, 408, and l. 7, c. 179.

on them, not only to join in a Protest against that Peace, which they had publicly concurred in making, and which they were bound by oath to observe, but also to sign a *Resolution* that they would oppose it with all their power! The Bishops of *Dublin, Cashil, Ossory, Cork, Waterford, Clogher, Clonfert*, and French of *Ferns*, subscribed it; and they all pledged themselves not to produce, but to keep it a profound secret, until the Supreme Council's Treaty with Ormond should be signed! * And yet—such is Irish *Spiritual* power—this nest of Conspirators gave itself the name of a *holy Synod*, with a Pope's Nuncio at its head!

On the same day Rinuccini prevailed *privately* on Glamorgan to sign a writing, whereby he undertook, “that in case 10,000 Men were “landed in England, the Articles being till “then kept *secret*, the King should privately “oblige himself never to employ any other “than a R. Catholic Lord Lieutenant; to “allow the R. Catholic Bishops to sit in

* Nuncio's Mem. fol. 1023, Carte vol. 1. p. 562. *Vindiciæ Catholicor. Hib.* p. 20, &c.

78 *Maynooth Education—Secret Meetings.*

“Parliament, &c.” To make his party stronger in the Assembly, he recommended to the Pope several persons, whose sentiments agreed with his own, to fill the Sees, which the Council, *who before had the nomination of them*, had kept vacant. *

He assembled the Bishops *privately* at his house again, Feb. 6th, 1646, and prevailed on them to sign an Instrument in favour of Articles proposed by himself, to be *kept secret, till there was occasion to produce them*, which he called the *Pope's Peace* ! †—Feb. 18, he *privately* prevailed on Glamorgan to ratify these Articles in the Queen's name, by an instrument which Glamorgan signed, undertaking, in the King's name, that they should be ratified by his Majesty ! ‡ On the 19th he extorted from Glamorgan an oath, written and worded by himself, § that he would stand by the Pope's

* Ibid. fol. 1025. Carte ib.

† Ib. fol. 1063, 1066, 1077. Vindiciæ Cathol. Hib. p. 20.

‡ Ib. fol. 1077—1088, Carte ib. p. 565.

§ He placed no great confidence in Glamorgan, though a Catholic, because he knew that that nobleman would go any lengths for the Royal cause, and that Lord Muskery's mother,

Nuncio, against all the Relations and favourers of Ormond, and against all who would oppose the Pope's treaty or his measures, &c. *

The assembly of Waterford, which consisted of ten Bishops, several Vicars and heads of Mendicant Orders, met Aug. 6, 1646, on *pretence of a Visitation*, but they had scarcely assembled, when they declared all those excommunicated who adhered to the Peace, though the faith of the nation had been publicly pledged to it! They interdicted all the Churches, forbad Divine Service in all cities and towns which permitted it to be proclaimed or received, suspended all Priests who preached or spoke for it, or dared to absolve any of its abettors, and excommunicated also all who should pay, or receive, any money or assessments in obedience to their orders, and all soldiers who should offer to put such orders in execution!

After such examples as these, and I could

only daughter of Donnogh O'Brian, Earl of Thomond, was aunt to Glamorgan's wife.

* Ib. fol. 1091---1094 Carte ib. This oath was signed by Glamorgan and under his seal. It is dated Feb. 19.

give hundreds without going back so far, * is it necessary to observe that Ireland ought to be extremely jealous of such *private* Conventicles as those, which were lately held by the Irish Bishops assembled at Tullow, and Dublin, in 1809, 1810, 1811, and 1812? If these instances will not suffice, let them read the letters of *Vargas* and *Visconti*, who describe the fatal influence of such private Conventicles of Bishops and Nuncios on the Council of Trent.

When the Spaniards, who felt their ancient rights curtailed by Rome, proposed a decree that Episcopal power is of Divine Institution, the Legates contrived that the Seven Canons on holy orders, should be previously framed in their *private meetings*, and then publicly proposed, without any allusion to that question, which, if carried, would annihilate the Roman Court maxim, that all Bishops hold their authority as *Delegates from the holy See*. †

* See Milner's Letter to Abbe Benar, in Columbanus's Historical Address, part 2, pag. 36. Compare Abbe Vivier's Letter of Dec. 24, 1812, in the Appendix.

† Without referring to Sarpi or to Courayer's notes, or even to the pious Vargas, or to Visconti, or to Langbane, I

Lainez, the 2d General of the Jesuites, was purposely kept in reserve by the Legates, to be the last Speaker on the subject; and he employed all his art, to prove the doctrines which have been since taught by the *Bellarminian* school, and are now taught at Maynooth, that

refer even to the favourite Roman Courtier Pallavicini; but Visconti is much more interesting. It is evident, that the quaint and servile Philips, never read those authors. He confines himself, in the usual style of sycophants, who are *afraid of truth*, to these few words—"It is visible from *the caution*, with which the Articles concerning Episcopacy are drawn up, that the Council of Trent *avoided* an explicit decision of the nature of the right from which the jurisdiction of that order is derived." *Life of Pole*, 4to, pag. 406.

The truth is, that of 181 Prelates who voted, 59 according to Sarpi, 54 according to Pallavicini, voted for the divine right of Episcopacy; but many, says Visconti, absented themselves from indisposition, and *other reasons*.

Most decidedly, the Vicars Apostolic, Drs. Poynter, and Castabala, who *command* me, on pain of heresy and suspension, to subscribe to the superiority of Episcopal jurisdiction by *divine right*, and order that the rites of the Church shall be denied me, if I do not, are most shamefully ignorant; not only of the doctrines of Catholicity, but even of the maxims of their own Court! Else why attempt to make an *article of faith* of that very doctrine, which that Court has so studiously endeavoured to condemn.—See Dr. Poynter's letter of June 9, 1812, calling upon me to declare, as an article of faith, that Bishops are *jure Divino* superior to Priests in the power of jurisdiction!"

82 *Maynooth Education—Episcopal Power.*

the Pope has unlimited *plenitude of power*; holding immediately from God, whilst all Bishops derive from him, as his *Delegates*; “*Apostolica Sedis gratia*,” that he alone gives authority to general Councils; that he can decide definitively on all questions of faith and discipline, enacting Laws which shall be binding by the plenitude of his power; that he can dispense in all the Canons, and all Ecclesiastical Laws, without even assigning a cause, by his mere *motu proprio*, as in the present Pope’s Bull of deposition against the exiled Bishops, Clergy, and Nobility of France; that his is the supreme right to crown Kings and Emperors, as he did Buonaparte; and that no Council can be infallible independently of him, who must confirm its Decrees!—Father Mamachi, a Dominican Friar, master of the Pope’s *sacred* palace, for every thing is *sacred* at Rome,—Father Mamachi, the *sacred* friend of Doctor Troy, who often honoured me with a *sacred baccia-mano*, and the word “*schiaro*,” your slave, a usual mode of salutation in the Capital of the Christian world,—*Mamachi*, the revisor of all books, the

supreme head of the Holy Office, next in power to the Pope, published in 1752, the first edition of his Christian antiquities, and, so lately, if I mistake not, as in 1785, his 2d edition, in the 4th volume of which he alleges a *cloud of theologues*, who have written in favour of the Pope's *indirect* power over the temporalities of Kings! He does not indeed expressly decide, that it is an *article of faith*; but the impression made on the mind of the young Student, is in favour of that doctrine; it is a doctrine supported by so many grave Divines, so naturally flowing from the *plenitude of power*, and never renounced, and much less condemned by the Holy See; nay, on the contrary, maintained by three successive Bulls of Paul V, against King James's oath of allegiance; by four successive Pontiffs, and their Nuncios, against the Irish remonstrance; and by all their Theologues and Vicars, who have declared repeatedly, that the contrary doctrine is "*non tam opinio quam hæresis.*"

13. It is true, that the Irish Bishops have, by accepting our present oath of allegiance, re-

nounced on paper the *indirect* power. But, here is the spot where *Columbanus* has struck the hardest blows, shewing that their *practice* is in diametrical opposition to their oath. Do they not hold, that the discipline of the Council of Trent is as binding on Irish Catholics, as the doctrine of Seven Sacraments? and does not that discipline expressly grant to the Pope, and to Bishops, as the *Pope's Delegates*, powers which directly clash with that oath, on this very article of *indirect* power? * Be it remembered, that in the Council of Trent, nothing was done to restrain the Papal power, or to reform its abuses; all that the French and Spaniards could obtain was, that the De-

* See Columbanus's Address, part 2, and page 99, &c. of these sheets. Will the *sworn Delegates* of Rome condemn those Bulls which maintain the *indirect* power, as fundamentally erroneous? I venture to assert that they will not dare to do it. Will they condemn the Bulls *In Cæna*, or *Unam Sanctam*?—When Archbishop Butler of Cashel had too hastily renounced the deposing power, and his example was followed so hastily by others, that it was too late to retract, he received from the *sacred* congregation of Propaganda a letter of *Rebuke*, because he had *presumed* to transact a business so *momentous*, without *previously* advising with the Court of Rome.

cree of the Council of Florence, in favour of the Papal Monarchy should *not be reenacted*, and that the divine right of Episcopcy should *not be explicitly denied!*

Pallavcini informs us, that in one Canon, proposed by the Papal party, these words were inserted, "If any shall say, that to the Successors of S. Peter, was not given by our Lord
"J. C. *plenitude of power to rule and govern*
"the Universal Church, let him be accursed."*

This, they said, was only an explanation of the Decree of Florence;† and it would have been carried, if the Cardinal de Lorraine, at the head of the French and Spaniards, had not vehemently opposed it; declaring, that the Florentine Council was not *legitimate*, but repugnant to those of Constance and Basil, which the whole French nation would rather die than controvert. §

* Pallav. l. 19, c. 12. † Labbe's Councils, t. 13, p. 515.

§ The Italian Bishop of Senigaglia was employed by the Legates to gain him over. But he sternly replied, that France would never, *in any sense*, approve of this proposition, "The Pope has authority to *govern* the Universal Church," and he added, that if it were again proposed, the French would pro-

14. Yet the Papal maxims which I have described are now in full force in Ireland. Does any one inform the Maynooth Students, that the sixth Œcumenical Council condemned Pope Honorius as a *heretick*? That Pope Liberius fell into Arianism? That Pope Nicholas I. maintained the validity of Baptism, though not conferred in the name of the Father, the Son, and the H. G.?* that we should have many new Articles of faith, and strange ones too, were we to be governed by the Decretals? that the Decrees of Popes are not decisive, as Muratori has shewn in his *De moderamine ingeniorum*, unless approved of by the Church, *nisi posterior accedat Ecclesiæ assensus*; that this is no great compliment to the Pope, since the Decree of any other Bishop, or Provincial, or National Synod,

test against it, on behalf of the King and 120 Bishops. Du Puy's Memoirs, p. 556, Visconti's Letter, Feb. 2, 1563.

* Natal Alex. t. 1. Sæc. 3, p. 696. Bellarmine defends him by saying, that he erred "*ut persona privata*! Compare Natalis, t. 1, p. 732. Nicholas I. maintains, in his Rescript to the Gallican Clergy, that to deny faith to the spurious Canons of Isidore the Impostor, is as *heretical, as to deny faith to the Scriptures*! Can. Romanorum Dist. xix.

Maynooth Education—Dortrine of Calumny. 87

would, if so adopted by the Church, be equally intitled to respect; that the General Council of Constantinople, though rejected formally by three Popes, Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory, yet is now universally received; that on the other hand, the Council of Pisa, where 22 Cardinals attended, 4 Patriarchs, 12 Archbishops, 67 Bishops in person, and 85 by proxy, 67 Ambassadors, a great number of mitred Abbots and Clergy of the 2d order, though formally approved by a Bull of Alexander V, is yet *rejected from the list of Universal Councils, and no where received!*

15. The Maynoothians are further informed, at least by the practices of the Vicars Apostolic, that calumny is no sin, provided it is in favour of Bishops, against such writers as *Columbanus*; that persons who are guilty of such calumnies, need not retract them, but may go on, receiving and administering the sacrament, without making any atonement, for that the Episcopal dignity must not be compromised by any retractation, even though a Bishop should *falsely* charge *Columbanus*, with being a *Jansenist*,

88 *Maynooth Education—Doctrine of Calumny.*

with disbelieving all the doctrines defined by *all the Councils*; * nay, though he should corrupt the Scriptures, * or though he should profanely place the *discipline* of Trent on a level with the doctrines of Revelation ! † The following proposition was maintained in a public Theological Theses at Louvain, in 1645.—“ *It is but a venial sin, to calumniate, and impute false crimes, to ruin the credibility of those who speak ill of us !* §

* See Dr. Poynter's letter of the 9th of June.

* See Columbanus, No. IV. p. 20, &c.

† Of the Trent *Discipline*, which is thus profanely placed on a level with Articles of faith, see Columbanus's *Historical Address*, Part II. p. 13.

On the cabals and intrigues of the Roman Courtiers, at the Council of Trent, in order to establish the Universal Monarchy of Rome, by rendering all Bishops its *sworn Delegates*, and all Priests its abject dependants, I might refer to Sarpi's History of that Council, but as the Courtiers have condemned that book, I refer to the letters of the pious Vargas, who attended on the part of the Spanish Bishops, and those of Secretary Visconti, which not even the sworn Delegates can condemn.

§ Pascal's 15th Letter of 1656, on calumny. This maxim having been propagated in confession at the court of Vienna, the Princesses, holding calumny to be no sin, propagated such stories of the ladies of that court, that the greatest confusion

16. It has been well observed, that there are two species of popularity; one which is to be acquired, by flattering the prejudices, assailing the temporary difficulties, courting the bad passions, and pandering to the feelings and lusts of the populace; the other is to be won only by honourable means, by bearing up, under obstructions and obloquy, and by a firm and decided adherence, a stubborn and unbending attachment to truth.—Let those who will, pursue the former, I envy them not. They may riot for a season, but reason and Religion will triumph in the end. Were I alone concerned, I might content myself with what I have hitherto written. To the scurrility of my opponents, I would have only to oppose a dignified silence, by which I would add to the un-

ensued! Yet the Jesuit Caramuel, a witness of those transactions, maintains this proposition n. 1151,—“ Il est *constant* que c'est une opinion *probable*, qu' il n' y a point de peche mortel a calomnier fausement, pour conserver son honneur car elle est soutenue par plus de vingt Docterus graves, &c. de sorte que, si cette doctrine n etoit probable, a peine en auroit il aucune qui le fut en toute la Theologie.”

disguised candour of my manners, a portion of that patience of injuries, and sufferance of affronts, which distinguished the character of our common model. But millions are concerned in the maxims which are thus saddled on the Religion we profess. In the vile imputations to which they give but too melancholy, too certain, and undeniable, as well as polluted and detestable source, generations yet unborn are involved ! The character of the Catholic Religion is at stake ; the arbitrary maxims are revived ; the Irish National Church is rendered *Inquisitorial* instead of *Canonical*. Its Synods are *secret* ; its discussions are as private as those of the holy office. A Dominican Friar, one of the guardians of the Inquisition, has arrogated to himself, the direction of the whole machine ; his subordinate satellites, subservient to foreign influence, which he wields, obey his mandates, and compromise the Episcopal character, in obedience to his commands. The defence of their measures is then committed to a *Rinuccini* Barrister, who, utterly ignorant of his subject, heaps together whole folios of fathers, and

makes a great book, which, it is hoped, will make the vulgar stare, and overwhelm Columbanus, if not by its argument, at least, in the opinion of the unlettered, by the prodigiousness of its pedantic ponderosity!

17. When matters are brought to such a pass, it is every man's duty to be a soldier if he can; and, as in a dangerous conflagration, or sudden bursting in of the sea, or scaling of the city walls by an enemy, the laws of nature oblige us to fly to arms in self-defence, so is it become my duty to pick up stones from the limpid stream, to proceed with my sling against the Philistines, and to vindicate the principles of my ancestors, against the pernicious maxims of foreign intrigue.

I blush to observe, that Irish Catholic petty-foggers, of the 19th century, undertake to be the hireling maintainers of such maxims, whilst it is a notorious fact, that so far back as in 1661, John Austin,* an *English Catholic Lawyer*,

* Reflections on the oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance, by a Catholic Gentleman, and obedient Son of the Church and Loyal Subject, printed 1661.

writing on the same maxims, uses these remarkable words :—

“ It is true, that the teaching of such maxims, brings very great temporal commodities to those few, that have the cruelty to their country, to become the preachers and apostles of them. *Great favour and power they gain thereby abroad* ; and therefore, they will take it kindly of the English Catholics, if, for a mere secular advantage of theirs, they will be content to sacrifice their estates, honours, families, and lives, as traitors to the laws, and withal bring an unavoidable scandal on the Catholic Religion besides ! But truly, this is too dear a rate to be paid for such a commodity. Surely, it is of greater concernment now, for his Majesty’s security, to unite all Catholics, with one heart, to assist and defend him, by allowing an *Ecclesiastical Government* among them, by which there will be produced great security to the State.

Now, to what special parties, both *within* and *without*, the continuation of a defect so prejudicial is to be imputed, is but too well known. It is not to be doubted, but that the forementioned party, will make use of all their skill and power, to oppose all good correspondence among them, upon more than one notice. 1st, A strong affection which they have for independence on the State, and to a promoting of their own particular interests, by which mean they have got great *power abroad*, little for the public good of this kingdom. 2dly, They well see, that by this only means (of a National Church,) those wicked principles, which have made them heretofore eminent abroad, must necessarily then be renounced. They will no longer be looked upon as the apostles of a foreign temporal power, either *direct*, or, which is as bad, *indirect*. These cannot but prove *great mortifications*. They have a strong apprehension, that, having been the sole causes of those rigours against the whole body of English Catholics,

they shall have but a small portion in any future indulgence, without an explicit and *satisfactory* renunciation of their principles; and an assurance given *to teach the contrary*, as they were obliged by an *Arrest* of the Parliament of Paris in 1622.

And that this was no suspicion groundlessly taken or invented, there was produced a well known *verified* story, happening towards the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign; for that Queen, being at last satisfied of the loyalty of certain Catholic Priests, had a purpose to shew some indulgence, and qualifications of the laws to them. Hereupon certain of their brethren went to Rome, to carry such good news thither, whither being come, they were branded by that *party* with the names of *schismatics*, *spies*, and *rebels to the See Apostolic*, and, moreover, there was one of the party (T. F.) compiled a treatise in Italian to advise his holiness, that it was not good or profitable to the Catholic cause that any liberty or toleration should be granted by the state of England to Catholics—and why not good for the Catholic cause? Because not for their own interest; for having given sad proofs of their *temper*, they did, not without reason, suspect, that if only good loyal Catholic subjects were tolerated, their so dangerous, and to themselves only *advantageous*, principles, must be abandoned.

It is not therefore to be expected but that a reform in these matters would be to them very *unwelcome*, but the commodities and benedictions flowing therefrom are inexpressible; 1. for then we should be free of all suspicion of *intelligence of designs abroad*.—2. Matters of discipline and spiritual government would not be only and immediately governed by a *Court* too far distant from us, and too much suspected by the State here.—3. English Catholics would be free from a burthen, and the King from jealousies to which no other in the world are obnoxious. For in France, &c. none dare, under utmost penalties, execute *orders*, or publish *mandates*, without *express*

allowance from the State, though such Briefs touched only spiritual matters, whereas, in England, when any such Briefs are published at Rome, although upon information of one interested party, not only the consciences of particular Catholics are disquieted, whilst some of their Directors press the validity of them, and others reclaim, but the state also, not causelessly, entertains jealousies and suspicions of secret practices, not being at all, or not sufficiently informed, all which inconveniencies, by such a Church Government, would be easily avoided.---Lastly, by this means, Catholics would be enabled to receive from his Majesty any orders that may be for his service, and effectually put them in execution.*

18. Here let us pause, and contemplating the horrors in which our country was involved in the 17th and 18th centuries, and musing over the tombs of a *Macmahon* Bishop of Clogher, a *Clanricard*, a *Worcester*, a *Caron*, and a *Walsh*, can we refrain from indignant lamentation, whilst we observe the genuine doctrines of Catholicity, for which they so nobly fought and fell, thus maintained against the political maxims of the Roman Court, 200 years ago, by

* Cassander justly observes that: "no controversy would ever have arisen on the Pope's supremacy, if they themselves had not, from motives of ambition and avarice, exaggerated the extent of their jurisdiction beyond its just bounderies." Cassandri Consult.

an English Barrister, and yet these very political maxims, which have brought such disgrace on our religion, saddled on that very religion in the 12th year of the 19th century by the wretched Pettyfoggers of our native country! Yes—hireling advocates for *blind* obedience—You who are paid to scribble in favour of a system of blind Mahometan obedience, you who would establish the idol of worldly pride and domination in the sanctuary—You who would have the second order of our national hierarchy administer religion to their flocks with the tame servility of brutes, rather as *machines* to be wound up by their Bishops, than as men endowed with rational and religious souls, —You who would reduce our whole national hierarchy to one exclusive order, of *self-appointing, secret-meeting, and all-deciding* Autocrats, you, who dare to deny to Ireland the canonical liberties established by the wisdom, the sanctity, the learning and the experience of succeeding ages, because, forsooth, *you choose* so to do,—look back to the calamities of your country, look to the ignorance and brutality which such

a system must infallibly produce amongst the Clergy, wherever it is established;—look to Spain, Portugal, and Italy, where every man who dared to speak out was condemned—and then say whether Columbanus, who opposes your barbarizing system of *blind censures*, and *excommunications*, and gagging acts, ought not to stand erect, in the conscious dignity of virtue, and hurl back your infamous censures into your faces, as destructive of the canonical laws of the Catholic Church!

When the Carmelites who derived their origin from Enoc, had interest enough in the Court of Madrid, not only to be believed, but to have the learned *Papebroc*, and all the Bollandists condemned by the Inquisition, for having dared to shew that they really derive their origin from an obscure Devotee of the 12th century, they too had hireling Pettyfoggers, like you, who wrote Pamphlets to prove that Papebroc was a heretic; but Catholic Europe soon saw into the cheat, and the Antedeluvian Carmes of the race of Enoc, were permitted to choose their place amongst the *clean* or the *unclean* beasts of the

ark of Noah.—*Barrister Theologues!*—Dark
Lanterns of Dublin bar! Dabblers in The-
ology, of which, at every step, you betray
ignorance the most consummate! Go—ponder
on that *leaden sceptre* of the sons of *Enoc*,
which you are endeavouring to wield over
your own Bæotian heads, with the vile de-
sign of overwhelming, if possible, the des-
tinies of your country! Go—in virtue of the
drowsy title of your Maynooth Diplomas, and
take your seats, soporiferously dull, amongst
the *clean* or the *unclean* beasts of the Ark of
Noah! you may have holy precedence, *after*
the sons of Enoc, if you please; I only bargain
for myself and my friends, that we may not be
compelled by your *spiritual* sword, to herd with
such *intelligent*, and such *clean* society.

With respect to those *learned* Divines, who
compose *Addresses*, under the sign of the
favourite bird of Minerva, that emblem of
wisdom, that pet of Maynooth, they may be
allowed to write as many pamphlets of holy
ribaldry against Columbanus, as thousands of
casuistical folios and thousands of *Divines* can

supply, provided it be permitted to us, who seek for information, to look to their altars, and vestments, to their *ecclesiastical taxation*, to the *Bulls* and *Tests* that are enforced, as *sine qua nons*, against the second order of the Clergy. Will they inform us, in the names of the *Bellarmines* and the *Rinuccinis*, whom they servilely imitate, *haud passibus æquis*—Will they tell us, I say, and tell us fairly, without equivocation, what do you contribute to the decency of public worship?—Are not your chapels built chiefly by the contributions of your Protestant countrymen, whom you most ungratefully calumniate, and hold up to the odium of popular discontent?—Do you frequent the Sacraments of that Church which you so ostentatiously boast of defending against the heresies of Columbanus?—What proof do you give of the sincerity of faith, or attachment to the genuine humility, and charity of the Gospel, whilst you splutter for the idol of Episcopal domination, endeavouring to erect the proud spirit, and to substitute the haughty standard of a Dagon on our altars

for the humility of the cross!—Go—read the accounts of those travellers, who have mixed with the Catholic inhabitants of *Mingrelia*. There you will find first editions of yourselves, and of the snivelling principles which you endeavour to ingraft upon the ingenuous character of your countrymen! There you will find Episcopal domination established in all the plenitude of irresistible authority; proceeding step by step, to claim the tenth child, as well as tenth sheaf, to be sold, for the maintenance of episcopal dignity, to the Turks! Yes—There you will find six self-appointing Bishops, agreeing in *private synods* to tax, not only the Clergy, but the whole population of the country, *as they please*, visiting their dioceses not for the purpose of correcting abuses, but of deposing and imprisoning all priests, who will not pay them annual stipends to the amount they require; not to enquire what well-worshipping, *miracle-monging*, devotions are practised, what exactions enforced on pain of *privation of Sacraments*, but to insist that a large portion of the plunder be resigned to

themselves; they allow the people to hold certain images to be more miraculous than others, provided they are more costly; and certain pictures and scapulars to be worn, as possessing some intrinsic, miraculous, undefinable, virtue, like the amulets of *Tippo-Saib*!

Holy Barristers!—Do inform us whether that wise, that solemn *night* bird who gravely presides over your *classical* schools, will permit you to see, in broad daylight, the consequences of the *blind* maxims you are so *piously* endeavouring to introduce?

Do you know that in *Mingrelia*, a waxen doll, called the *Bambino*, which is rocked in a holy cradle on Christmas night, is said to possess the *miraculous power* of curing all disorders; that great presents are made to this doll; that the chief bishop put a diamond ring of great value on its finger, hoping, or pretending to hope, that it would cure his most holy grand nephew, then ill of the whooping cough; that the servile priests of his diocese, in compliance with his injunctions, went in solemn procession, with tapers lighting in their hands,

and prostrated themselves before this doll, *adoring it*; that then, chaunting psalms, they placed it in a magnificent carriage, lined with crimson velvet, under a sparkling canopy, *tempest*ed with clouds of diamonds, and had it drawn by six cream-coloured horses, to the palace where the child lay; that all the people knelt and adored it in the streets through which it passed, the priests waving their Censers, and burning aromatic perfumes as it moved along; that a solemn vow was made by the chief bishop, that if the child recovered, he should, from his very infancy, be dedicated to the Church; and that the child dying, he claimed his diamond ring—because “*no purchase no pay!*”

19. Most holy Theologues of Maynooth, is this the blessed blind system of obedience, which you are so piously proceeding to establish on the necks of my countrymen!—Do you know that in Mingrelia, the ignorant people hold one picture to have more miraculous intrinsic value than another? that they make votive offerings of waxen legs, thighs, and other members which have been cured by miraculous pic-

tures and images? that they carry those images in procession, dressed up in the millinary tinsel and mummary of the modes, a gold watch "*a la Francoise*" dangling from a richly embroidered petticoat, on one side, another "*a l'Italien*" on the other side, the hair elegantly frized, craped, and powdered, "*a la Madoimeselle Clairon*," a long satin train held up by pages, a theatrical hoop, and head-dress, the people kneeling in the streets when this blessed doll passes! and for what object?—why, to be sure—because, being a *miraculous doll*, and possessing, of course, more inherent virtue than any other, it may protect the people; it may arrest the progress of a Volcano, it may restrain the impetuosity of an enemy! and they religiously believe—and no doubt our Irish *poddle* Barristers believe—that those pictures and images, sometimes open their eyes, and shut them again, at the approach of impending calamities; *

* See a book intitled, "*Miraculous Events in Italy*," 4th edition, announced year after year, by Keating in his catalogue, at the end of the *Ordo Recitandi* of this year, 1813, and Milner's *Miracles of S. Winefrid.* *ibid.*

yea—that they fly over seas and mountains into unknown regions where they appear again, and perform new prodigies in favour of people who are more worthy of their regard! *

20. Alas! if the maxims of sound criticism and genuine catholicity were taught at Maynooth, instead of those vile principles, which are inculcated by a Plowden and a Clinch, if those maxims were fairly illustrated by referring to bulls, † to miracles, and to forgeries, which originated in the pride and the passions of contending *Jesuists* and *Jansenists*, *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*—all fomented by the

* I leave it to intelligent readers to judge whether the assassins of the Marquisate of Ancona were more worthy of the kind visit of our Lady of Loreto, than the savages of Dalmatia, from whom she took her miraculous flight in the 13th century.

† For fourteen years Peter Walsh was deprived of all his ecclesiastical functions, and excommunicated by *Roman Bulls*, on account of the Irish Remonstrance, which is now acknowledged by all the world to have been neither heretical nor schismatical, but as orthodox as the Gospel!

For this same Remonstrance, he was publicly excommunicated at Brussels in 1670, as in his letter to the Bishop of Lincoln, p. 158, and under the successive Pontificates of Innocent X. Alexander VII. Clement IX. Clement X. and Innocent XI. as in the same letter, p. 167.

Court of Rome, if no one were allowed to be promoted to any ecclesiastical preferment, until he had sworn that he would decry those books, which maintain such false miracles, and principles, to the utter disgrace of our religion, if our youth were informed that the miracles of later ages originated, for the most part, in the avarice of the mendicant orders, who expected thereby to gain a greater number of devotees, and more *grist to their mills*, if no Political Bulls or Censures were allowed to interfere with the genuine definitions of the Catholic Church, if no *new Tests* were allowed to be introduced, without the authority of the State, and by a free *national Council*, whose discussions should be as public as those in Parliament, then we should hear no more of such fabulous miracles,*

* I have seen a book in which S. Francis is compared to our Saviour, and *proved* to be greater than J. C. by the number of his miracles ! to have murdered a man in order to prove the truth of his doctrines by raising him to life ! to have made a ladder, by which all those who took his habit, might *mount up* directly to Paradise, so as to escape Purgatory ! that no Devil can injure any man, woman, or child, who wears that habit ! that when one Father Cregius fell into a pit, and

or *uncanonical censures*, as those of *Father Murphy*, and *S. Winfred's* well. Our people would learn that neither Papal Bulls, nor Trent Discipline, are articles of faith, that, at a less enlightened period than ours, the Catholic Parliament of Tours ordered, (Aug. 5, 1591,) Pope Gregory XIVth's two Bulls of that year to be torn in pieces by the public Executioner, and burned in the market-place, as *seditionous, damnable, full of impiety, and impostures!* Then instead of being corrupt in opinion, lax and hypocritical in practice, servile and debased in conversation, instead of deviating and degenerating from the piety of their ancestors, we

was bound hands and feet by a legion of 10,000 Devils, he escaped merely by saying "*Domini Diaboli Ego sum Franciscanus,*" Master Devils I am a Franciscan!--See the *Querelles Littéraires*, ou Memoires pour servir a l' hist. des Revolutions de la Republique des Lettres. Compare the scarce and valuable works of our learned Countryman *Richardus Ardmanus*, from which it appears, that each mendicant order invented miracles to establish its fame above that of its rivals, and that in their miraculous contests they persecuted each other as heretics with fire and sword.

In 1562, the Dominicans obtained a Bull, which confined to them *exclusively* all the Miracles and Indulgences of our Lady of the Rosary. *A very profitable monopoly!*

should see our people sincerely Catholic, we should not behold with cold indifference, the profligacy of the lower orders, their profanation of sacred things, the walls and fences of their church-yards universally levelled to the ground, the bones of their fathers scattered in indiscriminate confusion over the surface of the earth, the dead, in many instances, interred without the rites of interment, without reverence for consecrated ground!

Yes, holy Barristers—with cold blooded indifference, you behold their marriages celebrated, without being duly registered; their children baptized without any legalizing of progeny; that to escape nocturnal depredation, the Gentry must be cap in hand to the Mob; that the very ploughshare escapes theft only from a superstitious apprehension of something called *bad-luck* which would pursue the plunderer to his grave! and yet you argue that the people ought to be kept in ignorance; that the reading of the New Testament is dangerous; that superstition is a good substitute for religion; that the doctrine of *blind* obedience to despotical

Bulls, and *unjust* Censures, must be inculcated ; and that an *Algerine* Government may be substituted for the sacred Canons of the Christian Church ! You resolve that you are very conscientious men, because, if you were not, you would have only to read your recantations, and you would then come in for seats in Parliament. Strange foppery ! you know well, that every Irishman who is guilty of such a crime beomes infamous ; an outcast from society ; the scoff and the scorn of Protestants as well as Catholics ! and yet, you arrogate the negative merit of a that of forbearing to be infamous ! * An honest man disdains to appeal to such evidence from the solemn testimony of his own conscience.

* “ Resolved that our long continued endurance, under the pressure of the Penal Code, from which a *sacrifice of conscience*, would have *instantly relieved us*, is proof *incontrovertible*, that the sacredness of an oath is no where more binding than on the consciences of Irish R. Catholics ! ” Resol. vi, of certain Bishops, in a *secret Synod*, Dublin, Nov. 18, 1813. A Hindoo woman will rather burn on her husband’s funeral pile, than expose herself to ignominy and detestation.

§ VI. *Historical narrative of eleven Priests confined in Newgate for not renouncing the Pope's pretended Deposing Power.*

1. Of all the transactions of the 17th century, that which, next to the Irish massacre, most injured our ancestors, and led to overwhelm their posterity by the penal code, was the rejection of the Irish Remonstrance, and King James's test of allegiance, in compliance with the injunctions of Rome! The second order of our Clergy, who were not so immediately under Italian influence, felt it their duty to subscribe these tests, and several wrote invincibly in their defence. But the sworn delegates of the Roman Court issued their suspensions, ordering them rather to submit to *martyrdom for the Catholic faith!**

When James's oath was enacted, even the Archpriest Blackwell published his opinion that it might be taken, and wrote in its defence; nor

* See Bellarmine's Letter to Blackwell, in Dodd, vol. ii. p. 522.

did he recede from that opinion when the Pope's Bull, and Bellarmine's Letter, were produced against him, for he took the oath June 24, 1607, as in Dodd's History, and *several Clergy, Regulars, and Laymen*, followed his example! But then the Roman Courtiers had recourse to *uncanonical Censures*, as they now have in the case of Columbanus; the Pope deprived him of his office of Archpriest, and conferred it on the more obsequious, and *blind* obedience sycophant, George Birket, in 1608!—Thus were the Sacraments rendered subservient to intrigues, and worldly pride, and courtly ambition, triumphed in the name of God! Yes! Sacraments which were instituted for the remission of sin, assumed now the *assassin* character which was saddled upon them; and a black Eunuch of the Seraglio could not be more successful in duplicity and finesse, with the aid of a dagger and a Sultana, than George Birket was with the aid of the censures of the Catholic Church!

King James's invincible defence of the oath of allegiance was now overwhelmed by a *Religious cry*. The works of the Jesuites Bellarmine and

Suarez against it, were extolled as masterpieces of Catholicity, and the deposing doctrines were rammed down the throats of the English Catholics, *without the least modification*, throughout a period of 183 years ! *

2. What if it should appear that the same doctrines are still adhered to *in practice*, that the present Pope's Bulls *Qui Christi Vices*, and *Ecclesia Christi*, in which they are manifestly referred to, and *acted upon*, are held up as models of Catholicity, by the Synods of Tullow and Dublin of the last three years, if the Bulls *Unam Sanctam*, and in *Cena Domini*, and *Unigenitus*, are still upheld as dogmatical decisions, if the discipline of Trent, by which a *very direct* power is granted to the Pope over the temporalities of Kings, is preached

* Sir J. Throckmorton says that if, in 1778, the Catholics had had the weakness to recur to Rome, they would not *have been permitted to* abjure the deposing power. Second Letter, Lond. 1791, p. 71, and again Appendix, p. 75.

Cardinal Howard writing from Rome, April 10, 1680, declares that Rome never will permit the oath of *allegiance* to be taken more than the oath of *supremacy*. See his Letter in Dodd. vol. iii, p. 386.

up as equally obligatory with articles of faith, if Dr. Butler of Cashel was rebuked by Rome for having introduced the abjuration of the deposing power into our oath of allegiance, and that abjuration is consequently *surreptitious* with respect to Rome, then it will follow that the renunciation of those maxims *on paper*, requires to be backed by their abjuration in *practice*, else the day may not be very distant, when, as heretofore, our people may be misled by other Synods of Jamestown, other *secret* conventicles of Waterford, and be entangled in theological quibbles, which would render oaths of allegiance as nugatory, as are the assertions of the Bishop of Castabala.

3. Let us be instructed by history—There is yet extant a Petition to Pope Paul V, signed by eleven priests, who were under sentence of death in Newgate, for refusing James's oath in 1612. Two of their companions had already suffered death for this offence. They died in resistance to legitimate authority, and by the instigation of a foreign power!

In their Petition they entreat of his Holi-

ness, by *all that is sacred*, to attend to their horrible situation, and they beg of him to point out to them *clearly*, in what that oath, for which they were condemned to die, is repugnant to Catholic faith.* But yet, influenced by the courtly maxims, they declare their belief in his unlimited power, and they conclude with a solem Protest of blind submission to all his Decrees, with an obedience as implicit, as if Rome were another Mecca, or as if the Vatican were the Seraglio of a Mahomet!

My heart swells with mingled emotions of

* “ In ergastulo, pedore, squalore, ærumnis conficimur, bonorum sodalities, amicorum solatio privamur, in tenebris vivimus!—Ex hoc Carcere, in quo decem et tres sacerdotes, ob jusjurandum repudiatum, compingimur, ex hac inquam schola martyrum, duo ex nostris, invictissimi martyres, in arenam prodeuntes, anno præterito, spectaculum exhibuerunt Deo, angelis, hominibus gratissimum, &c.---Per horum te martyrum sanguinem, per labores et æumnas, per vincula, Carceres, tormenta. Cruciatu, per invictam patientiam, si minus ista movent, per viscera misericordiæ Dei nostri, partem solitudinis tuæ afflictissimis Angliæ rebus impende, &c. Sunt qui inter Te et Cæsarem fluctuant. *Ut veritas elucescat, dignetur sanctitas tuo palam omnibus facere quænam illa sint in hoc Religionis Sacramento quæ a parte fides et saluti adversantur*, &c. Dodd. vol. iii, p. 524.

pity on one side, and horror and indignation on another, when I contemplate the dilemma in which those wretched men were thus placed, by the pride and the ambition of their superiors ! Before them was Tyburn, behind them stood, armed with fulminating thunders and terrors, that grim disgrace, in the opinion of their flocks, by which they would be overwhelmed as apostates, if they opposed the mandates of Rome ! On one side conscience stared them in the face, with S. Paul ; *—on another, a Vicar Apostolic menaced refusal of the Sacrament, even on the eve of death !—*This* covered them with ignominy as apostates,—*that*, though frightful to humanity, was yet attended with posthumous renown !

4. Religion indignantly wraps herself up in her shroud of deepest mourning, before the idol of ecclesiastical domination, when she ob-

* Rom. xiii.—Wherefore ye must needs be subject (to the civil powers) not only for wrath, but also for *conscience sake*. S. Paul preached this doctrine when the established powers were Pagan and persecuting.----Pope Paul V. preached the reverse when the established power in England was Christian and tolerant ! *Pudet hæc opprobria nobis !*

serves the Roman Court sacrificing to its insatiable ambition, the lives of so many heroes, who were worthy of a better fate! perverting Sacraments which were instituted for the sanctification of souls into engines of worldly passions, and rendering them subservient to the policy of those passions, and panders to their intrigues!

I can fancy a haughty Pontiff, on receipt of this humble Petition, agitated by contending difficulties; I can fancy him seated under a crimson canopy, surrounded by his sycophants, debating in a *secret consistory*, whether those unfortunate men shall, or shall not have permission *not to be hanged*! The blood of the innocent was now to be shed, or the deposing and absolving doctrines, and all the Bulls and Decisions in their favour, to receive a deadly wound, which no ingenuity could parry, no force could avert, and no skill could cure.

5. Barrister Theologues of the poddle!—Blushing beauties of Maynooth! Do let us hear what middle course you would have devised in such *existing circumstances*!—In the dedica-

tion of one of your hodgepodges to Dr. Troy, you declare that whatever opinion he dictates, *that opinion is yours!*—*A fortiori*, your opinions would have been shaped by those of Pope Paul V, who deliberately encouraged the unfortunate Priests in Newgate to suffer *death!* to be offered up as victims on the altar of his pride, rather than resign his pretensions to the deposing power, or retract his decrees! The Catholic Religion, calumniated on account of the ambition of his Court, had travelled barefooted over the Alps and the Apennines, from the dreary cells of a dark and noxious prison, and stood bareheaded, and trembling, petitioning for admittance at the haughty portals of the Vatican!—Aye—and admittance was refused!—Day passed after day, and no answer was received, but that which might be collected from the sullen silence of impenetrable obduracy and unbending domination! Both Sixtus and Pius V. had addressed their Bulls with these magnificent titles—“*We, who are placed on the supreme throne of justice—enjoying supreme dominion over all the Kings,*

and Princes, and States of the whole earth, not by human, but by Divine authority, &c.”* and now, how could it be expected that, in compliance with the Petition of eleven beggarly Priests of the second order, such magnificent titles should be resigned!—No, said the scarlet Cardinal, perish the idea!—let not an iota be yielded, else we shall lose our worldly dominion, “*Venient Romani et tollent nostram Gentem et Regnum.*” All the pride, and pomp, and glory of the Vatican, would then be swept away from off the face of the earth, and what would then be the fate of the thunders of scarlet Cardinals and purple Monsignores!

6. In consequence of this horrible decision, the following innocent *English* Clergymen, alas! how many Irish—suffered as victims to the domination of Vicars Apostolic, and the fatal influence of the Court of Rome.

1. *Rev. Mr. Cadwallader*, refusing to take the oath of allegiance, with a promise of pardon at the place of execution, if

* “*Nos in supremo justitiæ throno collocati, Supremam in omnes Reges et Principes universæ terræ, cunctosque populos, gentes, et nationes, non humana sed Divina institutione, nobis traditam potestatem obtinentes, &c.*”

he would comply, refused, and, in *blind obedience* to Rome, was executed at Leominster, Aug. 27, 1610. Dodd. vol. ii.

2. *Rev. George Geroase*, was executed at Tyburn, April 11, 1608, but was promised pardon a second time, if he would take the *oath of allegiance*, which he refused. *Ib.*

3. *Rev. Fr. Latham*, executed at Tyburn, Dec. 5, 1612, for refusing the *oath of allegiance*. *Ib.*

4. *Rev. George Napier*, hanged at Oxford, Nov. 9, 1610. The Vice Chancellor assuring him of pardon if he would take the *oath of allegiance*, which he refused. Dodd, *ib.* p. 373.

5. *Rev. Nicolas Atkinson*, hanged at York, 1610, for receiving orders by authority of the See of Rome, and for the additional circumstance of *refusing the oath of allegiance*. *Ib.* p. 376.

6. *Robert Drury*, hanged, London, Feb. 26, 1607. He was one of the 13 Priests who signed the famous Protestation of allegiance in the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, but refused the *oath of allegiance*, when it was offered him at his examination and trial, though he seemed inclined to take it before it was prohibited by the Pope's Briefs, as *several others were*, both Clergy and Regulars. *Ib.* p. 377.

7. *Rev. Matthew Flather*, was executed at York, 1608, but was promised his life if he would have submitted to the *oath of allegiance*. *Ib.*

8. *Thos. Maxfield*, hanged at Tyburn, July 11, 1616, had his pardon offered, if he would submit to the *oath of allegiance*, which he refused. On the day of his execution, some unknown persons contrived to hang garlands on the gallows, and scattered greens and flowers all underneath, to signify that his death was honourable. *ib.* p. 378. It was noised about that great numbers of Catholics appeared at his execution, in order to dip their handkerchiefs in his blood, and convey away his reliques. To prevent this, the mob seized his quarters, and

threw them into a hole near the gallows, from whence they had dug the bodies of two malefactors, formerly buried there, and tumbling Mr. Maxfield's quarters into the hole, they covered them with the said carcasses. However his friends were so industrious as to recover them again that night, and, as my Memoirs inform me, not without an accident that was somewhat surprising, (a *miracle!*) The night being very dark, continued so, till a bright sky appeared to favour them while they were digging for the body, and then it grew dark again to favour their going off. *Ib.*

9. *Rev. Thomas Garnet* had the favour offered him to be pardoned, if he would but take the *oath of allegiance*, but refusing it, he was executed at Tyburn, June 23, 1608. *Ib.* p. 413. Echard Hist. of Engl. p. 385.

7. Let us now consider who, in the eye of unprejudiced reason, was the persecutor and executioner of those unfortunate men, James or the Pope?—The evidence of facts is irresistible. The question bears not one moment's examination, "*Qui facit per alium facit per se.*"

If it should be alleged that the Pope pitied those men, who died for his worldly maxims of aggrandizement, that he was not cruel by nature, but only by policy, and that he would have saved them if he could by money, or at any expence short of the sacrifice of pompous pride, and uncontrollable dominion, my answer

is that this aggravates his guilt. The horrors which hypocritical pride and ambition create, must be laid at the doors of those hypocrites, who disguise their passions with the mask of sanctity, whilst, in reality, they persecute religion and oppress truth! Whether Moscow was burned by the French or by the Russians, the invaders are responsible; the necessity originated in them; he who steeps his sword in the blood of nations, because they will not tamely surrender their independence, whether he destroys those nations mediately by the aid of foreigners, or by his own immediate and lawless dominion, is guilty of the excesses which his outrages have provoked; and he is the more guilty if he executes, with calm deliberation, enormities, which the sudden impetuosity of passion might in some instances palliate, though no provocation could justify.

8. Yes, a *systematic* disregard to the rights of our fellow creatures, when covered with the mantle of religion, is terrible in its operations. Its watch word is *no quarter*; it spares not either friends, or foes, if they should ever

manifest a symptom of opposition; every obstacle to its remotest views must be crushed, whatever evils may ensue!—Yes—he who is barbarous from nature, may sometimes be overtaken by compunction, and review his crimes with detestation and horror; - but he who destroys his fellow creatures, or exposes them to destruction for the sake of personal advantages, sanctifying his impiety with the name of religion, imposes a false conscience on himself by casuistical quibbles; considers the crimes he occasions, and the blood he sheds, as necessary evils; with unfeeling indifference, under the influence of a system, reared by pride, and supported by sophistry, he sees humanity outraged, - and religion violated, and he glories with savage exultation in both.—I repeat then, that in the eye of *morality*, which a wise Statesman will ever be careful to cultivate, abominable is the use which may be made, horrible the hypocrisy which may be sanctioned by the Episcopal censuring power, as now exercised by the *sworn Delegates* of the Holy See.

To allege that the Roman Court exists no

longer is ridiculous. At no period of time was the influence of that Court greater, or so great, amongst the higher orders of the Irish Clergy than at present. In the meridian splendor of Rome she could give to Ireland no more than 500 *crowns* per ann. which were distributed amongst the four Archbishops. Her great power consisted in unlimited patronage, in granting bishopricks, livings, and dignities, within the realms of England and Ireland, and in inculcating and maintaining unlimited obedience to her Decrees.—She supported the *absolute* power of the Bishops, over the second order of the Clergy, as long as they enforced by blind censures the doctrine of her Bulls; and this system exists *in full force* to this day.

9. Well, says a smooth-faced Barrister-Theologue from Maynooth—what conduct would you pursue, *Columbanus*, were you one of those eleven prisoners in Newgate? Would you encounter the obloquy of the Catholics, and carry the stigma of apostacy to your grave? I hope in the mercy of God, that he would enable me to carry that cross, not only with patience, but

with cheerfulness also. “Blessed are they who suffer for righteousness.” Yes, I might be abandoned even by my friends; but the desert in which I might be condemned to take my solitary walk, would smile around me, and I would offer up my humble prayer in the gladness of my heart.

I know well, what a pang is that of affectionate regard, which experiences no return, but that of calumny and desertion. But—*sursum corda!*—I would look up to *Him*,—the Mighty One,—who will crown the *invisible* martyrdom of a worried spirit; to *Him* who will soothe the troubles of a heart which derives no consolation from present popularity, and which looks only to futurity for posthumous reward.

10. To my companions in Newgate, I would read S. Bernard’s book *De Consideratione*, in which he shews that Popes, and much less Bishops, have no absolute authority over God’s heritage, but are themselves subject to the laws of the Church. *—I would read for them the

* “Non enim tibi ille Petrus dare quod non habuit potuit. Numquid *Dominationem*? Audi ipsum, non dominantes, aii,

Letter of Gerbért, who was afterwards Pope Silvester II, to the Archbishop of Sens, in which he says—"Does it follow that because Pope Marcellinus apostatized to Paganism we are to follow his example? * I say decidedly that if the Pope offend against a brother Christian, and being repeatedly admonished, hearken not to the Church, he ought to be held as a Pagan; the higher his rank the more tremendous his fall. What if he should declare us unworthy his communion, unless in obedience to him we violate the rules of justice, he cannot therefore separate us from the communion of J. C. Even a Priest, unless he is convicted, or confesses his guilt, cannot be deposed.

in Cleris---et ne dictum sola humilitate putes, vox Domini est. Reges Gentium dominantur eorum vos autem non sic.--Planum est, Apostolis interdicitur dominatus." 1. 3.

* Num quia Marcellinus Papa Jovi Thura incendit, &c. ideo thuriferandum? Constanter dico quod si ipse Romanus Episcopus in fratrem peccaverit, præceptoque admonitus, Ecclesiam non audierit, præcepto Dei, est habendus ut Ethnicus. Quanto enim gradus altior, tanto ruina gravior est. Etiam Presbyter, nisi confessus, aut convictus, ab officio removeri non debet. Quænam majorse paratio quam a filii Dei corpore et sanguine? Quod si hic qui vitam ademit corporalem vel sibi, vel alteri, homicida est, hic qui sibi vel alteri vitam adimit sempiternam quo nomine appellandus est? &c.

or The Apostle says, Who shall separate us from the charity of Christ? Now what wider separation can there be, than that which separates us from the nourishment of our souls, the body and blood of our Lord? and if he who takes away the corporal life of man is a murderer, what shall we say of that murderer who deprives us of the nourishment of eternity? * You ought not therefore in conformity to an unjust censure, to be separated, or to separate yourself from communion, as if a legitimate sentence had been pronounced against you—but let the Laws of the Church be observed, which are the Gospels, the Apostles, the Prophets, the Canons which have been enacted by the Spirit of God, and *received by the Universal Church*, and finally the Decrees of the Holy See, when they *do not differ from these.* †

* What will Dr. Poynter say to this?

† “ Sit Lex communis Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, Evangelium, Apostoli, Prophetæ, Canones Spiritu Dei conditi, et totius mundi reverentia consecrati, Decreta Sedis Apostolicæ *ab his non discordantia*, et qui, *per contemptum*, ab his deviaverit, per hæc judicatur.” Rer. Gallic. Scriptores, Paris 1760, t. x, p. 413.

11. And now is any man such a block, so stupid, as not to see the abominable use that may be made of the Episcopal censuring power, unless it is rendered, by Penal Statutes, amenable to the Canonical Laws of the Christian Church, as it was in France, and even in Spain, and in the Netherlands?

If it should be alleged, that that power will never be abused in practice again—I answer, first, *give us security* that it will not, by an utter abandonment of the foreign maxims, and by the appointment of such teachers as will substitute the genuine doctrines and *laws* of the Church in their stead; otherwise, that which has been often done, may be done again.

The only certain method of judging what people would do, in any supposed case, is to consider what they *have done* in similar circumstances. In religious matters, particularly, there is an immediate connection between theory and practice. Is it not true, that this theory is actually enforced in the case of Columbanus? And is it not equally true, that that which is done in one instance, may be done in others?

In judging of opinions, we must determine their utility or their evil tendency, by the nature of the general spirit they inculcate, and the duties they enjoin; and is it not well ascertained, that wherever such principles have prevailed, the Court of Rome always found means, by the aid of sycophant Theologues, false devotees, *religious cries*, and suspensions, to prevent our taking oaths of mere civil allegiance, and obeying such civil laws, as clashed with the interests of Rome, although they contained not one tittle against Catholic faith. It was enough, by a *religious cry*, to brand them as heretical or schismatical!

Let any man but compare the quibbles, which, under Roman influence, were urged by Bishop Gibson, and the other Vicars Apostolic, against the English oath of allegiance, so lately as in 1790, with those urged by their predecessors against James's oath, from 1609 to that period, and it will be found that they agree even in words, turning entirely on the distinctions of *materially* and *formally* heretical, *conjointly* and *separately*! Let the Document of

1609, in Dodd, vol. iii. p. 387, be collated with Gibson's Pastoral Letter, in the Blue Book of 1790.—Some of the enlightened Catholics of that period, the *Englefields, Throckmortons, Stourtons, Townleys, Lawsons, Hornyholds, Berringtons*, good naturedly appealed to Rome against the religious cry raised against them on that occasion, by the sworn Ministers of its Court.—But fatal experience ought to have cautioned them against the futility of such a proceeding. The Roman Court rejected their appeal, and its sworn Delegates published their haughty reply! Let any man compare Sir John Throckmorton's Letters, addressed to the English Catholics of 1790, with *Columbanus's* to the Irish, and he will find that Sir John proceeds somewhat farther than Columbanus, in his protest against those uncanonical proceedings, which have caused such obloquy, inflicted so many calamities, sanctioned so many slanderous imputations, and brought so much disgrace on our religion! *

* Compare the Letter addressed to the Vicars Apostolic, by the Committee of English Catholics, dated January

Alas !—It can escape no man of common observation, that the Catholics of England are but a Colony *immediately* dependant on Rome ! Governed by the *sworn Delegates* of that Court, they are as directly subject to its controul, as those of the Papal States ; and nothing short of the strong hand of the State of England can emancipate them from the trammels of despotical

19, 1791, in which they respectfully expostulate with those Vicars on their disingenuous and uncandid proceedings, and their *Case* stated to *Mr. Hill*, his Majesty's Prime Serjeant at Law. See also the second *Encyclical Letter*, fulminated by the Vicars Apostolic of *Rama*, *Acanthos*, and *Centuria*, dated Jan. 11, 1791, in which they “ reject with detestation several publications, as well which *have appeared*, as which *may appear hereafter*, declaring them *schismatical, scandalous, &c.* They then exhort every Catholic to unite in opposing the oath, by presenting a *counter Petition* to Parliament, or by adopting whatever legal or prudent measure may be deemed the best.”

The English Catholic Committee's answer to this *Pastoral*, is dated Febr. 2, 1791. On the 8th they had a conference with the Vicars for an amicable arrangement, but in the midst of this conference, Gibson, V. A. of Acanthos, arose abruptly from his seat, and assuming a despotic manner and tone, arrogantly declared that all discussion was vain.---“ The only question, he said, is---whether the Committee *will, or will not submit.*” The question was immediately penned, and answered in the negative, by the Stourtons, the Petres, Sir H. C. Englefield, Sir J. Throckmorton, John Townley, T. Hornyhold, &c.

power, by which they are entangled without the least prospect of redress. So lately as in 1791, they were placed, by their Vicars Apostolic, in the horrible dilemma, either of separating from Rome, or, by adhering to it, of being reputed disloyal subjects! and why? because they had resolved to swear that the Pope has “*no jurisdiction that can, directly, or indirectly, affect or interfere with the Independence, Sovereignty, Laws, Constitution, or Government of this Kingdom!*”

In vain did the English Catholic Nobility reason and remonstrate. In vain did they publish, in the course of that year, an Address to their Countrymen of their own persuasion, protesting against the Encyclical Letters of those Vicars, as *imprudent, arbitrary, and unjust*; as encroaching on their natural, civil, and religious rights, and inculcating principles hostile to the laws and constitution of the Empire. In vain! The Vicars persevered, under the influence of Rome, to resist the Catholic Bill even after it had passed the Commons!—On June 8, when a general meeting was convened

for amicable arrangements, Walmesly and Gibson refused to attend; and it was only, after *the Bill received the Royal assent*, that, all further opposition being useless, these holy men learned to resign the crown of martyrdom, which they had hitherto recommended to their flocks, rather than openly resist the established laws of the land!

12. And now let us inquire *what security* have we, that those proceedings will not be recurred to again?—I demand, as a security, not only that the Ultramontane maxims shall be renounced in general, but each of them *separately*, and in detail; that no oath of allegiance shall be taken, in future, to any foreigner, under any pretext whatsoever; that the whole system of Bulls and Rescripts shall be subject to the controul of the civil power, as in Catholic France; that a liberal system of Catholic education be established at Maynooth, under the inspection of Dr. Lanigan of Dublin, or of such learned men, as have hitherto been most unjustly and cruelly excluded from every situation of emolument in the Catholic Church,

merely because they have opposed the Courtly maxims of the *Aulici Romani*! I demand, that the Bulls *Unigenitus*, in *Cæna Domini*, those of deposition against the exiled French Bishops, namely, *Ecclesia Christi*, and *Qui Christi Vices*, and all those which claim plenitude of power above the Canons, be formally renounced; and that the following maxim be formally assented to:—"That the Divine injunction to obey our
 "temporal Rulers, extends to every law of the
 "State, which does not militate against *articles*
 "of revealed faith, or discipline universally re-
 "ceived by the Catholic Church."

In short, that the principles of enlightened Catholicity be professed and taught, instead of those of the *Rinuccini* school, and that on *these conditions* the Catholics be for ever emancipated, as well from the Penal Statutes, which are disgraceful to the character of Englishmen, as from the spiritual domination of Vicars Apostolic, which is, if possible, more disgraceful to the Catholic Religion.

James's oath would never have been rejected by the Catholics of England, nor would the

loyal *Remonstrance* by those of Ireland, had they but Bishops canonically appointed, without any reference to foreign powers. Unfortunately the Reformation rendered them more dependant than ever they were before! Many of their Bishops were maintained by pensions from the Pope; all the dignified Clergy looked to Rome for advancement; all the inferior Clergy looked to the dignified for sycophant intrigue. Thus dependant, they *servilely* applied to the source of Ultramontanism for leave to take oaths, the precise object of which was a renunciation of Ultramontanism!—The answers were such as might have been easily foreseen.—Their Oaths were condemned; the condemnation was acceded to by subservient *Mitre-hunters*; and the idea of a Catholic has ever since been connected with that of an abettor of the most dangerous doctrines of the Ultramontane school! *

* “ One of the V. A. of Castabala’s objections to our having a national Church is, that there is not the most distant hope of our being able to replace the bounty of his Holiness, should we force him to withdraw it, (by establishing a national

§ VII. *The Portuguese Veto—Dr. Moylan's Private Arrangement with the Government of 1809.*

1. "Oh! but surely Dr. O'C. has recommended it to his countrymen, to resume their ancient right of electing their own Bishops, by Dean and Chapter, without any reference to the consent of the Holy See."

Very true—but he has expressly mentioned his reason; because, in the present state of Europe, when no reference can be had to the Holy See, unless this is done, the Catholic Religion must fail in Ireland. Bishoprics and Archbishoprics are now vacant, and cannot otherwise be provided with Pastors.

And now, if *Columbanus* is a schismatic for

Church.) "Have you friends, continues he, tauntingly addressing himself to Sir J. Throckmorton, have you friends ready to provide a foundation equivalent to that which we have for two hundred years enjoyed from the Pope?" Clergyman's Answer to a Layman's Letter, p. 16, and Sir J. Throckmorton's Reply, Lond. 1791, p. 28. Query---Do the English Vicars Apostolic continue still to receive pensions from Rome? or do they hope to receive them, if the Pope should be restored?

having used these expressions, so were all those Bishops who, when the House of Braganza succeeded to the throne of Portugal, in defiance of Spain, declared, by a Public *Instrument*, directed to the Pope, that unless he gave institution, not only to the Portuguese Bishops, but to those of all their Settlements in the Indies, they would give institution themselves. Did the Pope declare them Schismatics, for thus presuming to govern their own Church? Let us appeal to the experience of history !

During a period of ten years, John IV, of Portugal, had repeatedly applied to two successive Pontiffs, for the confirmation of the Bishops elect of that Kingdom, without effect. The Roman Court had *resolved*;—and its policy was, never, except in cases of extreme necessity, to recede. The King's Ministers at length assumed the tone of national independence; they applied to the Universities, as well of France, as of Portugal, for advice; the French National Synod of April, 1651, replied that the faithful ought not to be left without Pastors; in compliance with the arro-

gant pretensions of Rome; that the vacant bishopricks ought to be immediately filled, according to the ancient mode of canonical election, by Dean and Chapter; and that, as there was then only one Bishop remaining in Portugal, French Bishops would consecrate the Bishops elect of that kingdom, if Rome persisted any longer in pretending to such a cold blooded and tyrannical domination. This reply was followed up by a letter to that effect, which the French Clergy, with Christian fortitude, addressed to Innocent X.

2. The Portuguese allege in their *Memorial*, that they have a sovereign right to name their own Bishops; that they will receive no Bishop on any other terms; that if any other than the State of Portugal should name to Portuguese livings, suspected persons, inclined to the Spanish interest, might be forced upon them; that by his arbitrary proceeding the Pope derogated from the sovereignty of the crown of Portugal, in favour of the King of Castile; that if provision be made contrary to the rights of Portugal, in favour of the *private interests*

of the Roman Court, then Christ's rights are betrayed, and the spiritual sword made subservient to political designs;—in short, that they entered a *solemn Veto* against any Bishop not named by their own State—and that if Rome did not comply, within a given time, they would appoint Bishops by domestic arrangement themselves.

3. And now let me ask, was this schismatical? If it was—why did not the Pope declare it so? Is it not obvious, that, if it were schismatical, the Christian Hierarchy would entirely merge in the Pope? no other Church could establish a mission, as our Irish Ancestors formerly did, in Northumbria, Franconia, Burgundy, without his previous consent! Our Saviour gave mission to all regions of the globe—“*Ite in universum mundum, prædicate Evangelium omni Creaturæ!*”—But the Pope could, in this case, enter his *protest* against our Saviour, and assign limits to Revelation!

Frightened out of the den of his dark policy, terrified by the probable influence of the example which Portugal was about to give to all

Europe, Innocent X. found it *expédient* to yield, and he *consented*, forsooth, *motu proprio*, to grant Bishops to the Portuguese!

4. Again—During the long schism which preceded the Council of Constance, though one of the pretenders to the Popedom was acknowledged by France, did the Bishops elect of that kingdom always apply for confirmation to him? Did the Council of Constance insist that they should in future? Has not *Columbanus* given in his 5th No. the Decree of that Council, reenacting the elections by Dean and Chapter? When Francis I, who had designs on Italy, in order to conciliate the Pope, obliged France, by his *Concordat*, to receive Bulls of confirmation from Rome, did not the Clergy, the Parliaments, the Universities of France, unanimously remonstrate against it, appealing to the *Pragmatical Sanction* in defence of the liberties of the Gallican Church? Is it not well known that, in the late King of France's reign, the Pope's confirmation was, with respect to a great majority of the bishoprics, totally abolished? that with regard to the rest it was

only a *titular* right, a *shadow*, a mere matter of form?—The King presented, and the Pope was *bound* to comply. Even this, was considered a badge of national dependance; and it was so far abolished, that if a Bishop elect applied for Bulls of confirmation to the Pope, he incurred heavy penalties, which he could not characterize as a persecution of his religion, since that religion had subsisted so many centuries without any such application to Rome. *

5. Compared with this Christian fortitude of the Portuguese, and of the French, 200 *years ago*, the conduct of the Irish Bishops appears little short of treason to their country.

I have now before me a letter written by Dr. Moylan, dated Cork, May 12, 1809, in which he declares that the Irish Bishops are willing to enter into arrangements with Government, respecting appointments to bishoprics, provided two conditions be observed, the

* “Ces Bulles, says Le Gros, ne sont point necessaires, selon les Canons, c’ est une innovation des derniers tems, une veritable servitude, une occasion pour le Cour de Rome de faire valoir les pretensions Ultramontanes.”

dependance of Irish Bishops on the Pope, and the *utter annihilation of all the rights of the second order of the Irish Clergy in electing to vacant Sees!*

“If, says he, our friends (in Parliament) and Government have only in view (which I presume must be the case) to guard against all foreign influence in the appointment of the Irish R. C. Bishops, and to make sure of the loyalty of the persons elected to fill vacant Sees, an *arrangement can be made*, which shall *most effectually* answer their wishes and views, *without making any alteration in the present mode of appointment!* Let an application be made by the Bishops to the Holy See, with the consent and concurrence of his Majesty's Government, for a Concordatum, or Declaration, by which the *sovereign Pontiff* will engage that no person shall be nominated to any R. C. vacant See in this country, but such as shall *be elected and presented by the R. C. Bishops of this kingdom.* Let those R. C. Bishops, *who elect*, enter into the most solemn engagements, that can be reasonably required, that they will not elect or present any person to vacant Sees, but such as they conscientiously believe to be good and loyal subjects—Certainly they can judge much better of the dispositions of their Clergy, than his Majesty or his Ministers can, &c. A few posts ago I had occasion to write to my friend Sir J. Cox Hyppisley, and mentioned to him this plan, which then occurred to me. I prayed him to lay it before our friends, and if it was approved of, it would *settle matters to the general satisfaction.*”

6. I now appeal to every capacity, whether this scheme, and it is a scheme that is uni-

formly pursued by the Bishops, be not a manifest invasion of the right, always exercised by the second order of the Irish Clergy, to elect and postulate *sede vacante*? whether it be not an insidious attempt to destroy the canonical independence of the second order of our Hierarchy? whether it be not calculated to render the Episcopal order *absolute* in Ireland, on pretence of religion? and whether, under such uncontrouled and uncontroulable power, on the part of Rome, a single fragment of an Irish National Church would remain? Dr. Moylan argues, that the Bishops know better than the King or his Ministers who is loyal or disloyal—Now, independently of this vile system of Espionage, which he thus endeavours to establish under cover of religion, and that too most clumsily indeed, for no man can be such a block as not to see the drift of it, independently I say of this vile system, by which he would render every Bishop of Ireland a base and treacherous informer for Government, there is another consideration of great importance, that Bishops, impelled, like other men, by ma-

lignant passions, often misrepresent the characters of such Priests as dare to manifest the least dislike or opposition to their arbitrary proceedings, and brand them with the most odious appellation. Is it not evident that they who give the name of heretic and schismatic without just cause, without trial, without hearing, to *Columbanus*, may also give that of *rebel* to gratify a spirit of revenge!

Ten years had elapsed since Dr. Moylan had, in a private Synod of ten Bishops, subscribed resolutions, which they contrived privately to smuggle into the castle of Dublin, granting a Veto to the crown on certain conditions, derogatory to the rights and privileges of the second order of the Irish Clergy, and destructive of the canonical freedom of election of Bishops by Dean and Chapter, which had from time immemorial existed in the Irish Church, and so little had he and his *pious* Confres departed, in the course of said ten years, from these secret treasonable practices of 1799, that in 1809 he renewed them in a *private correspondence* with some of the leading persons

in Parliament, not only without consulting with the people of Ireland, not only without stipulating for the ancient *canonical rights*, and *immemorial usages* of the second order of the Irish Clergy, but expressly *betraying* them, for the purpose of usurping them to his own!

7. Countrymen—human laws are the best security we can have against the *pious* encroachments of human power. An enlightened Statesman may yet recal our people to a due sense of this undoubted truth. It is a sacred maxim that cannot be too often repeated, too calmly heard, too deliberately examined.

An enlightened Statesman may introduce an immortal reformation amongst us, without meddling with the articles of our faith, or altering the genuine discipline of our Church, without hallooing upon us the fury of a *John Knox*, or countenancing the ribaldry of a *Pat Duigenan*. If he is a Christian he will embrace us as brothers—if he is a man of stern morality himself, he will not countenance those latitudinarian maxims, which make all forms of worship equally good or indifferent. He would

rather see us good Catholics than bad Protestants, or *bad Christians*; he would contribute in all those ways which are most congenial to our feelings, to cultivate our morality rather than inflict upon it wounds, which in its present declining, debilitated, and degraded state, would leave only the external forms of Christianity in our native land:

8. In opposition to the horrible system of lawless power which is attempted, under cover of religion, to be established on the necks of my countrymen, once for all I repeat, 1. that the authority even of the Pope is limited by the canons.—2. That the canons were not canons in France, until they were *received by the French nation*.—3. That this was a fundamental law of the Catholic Church of *England* as well as of France.—4. That the Popes and their sworn Delegates have always endeavoured to subvert this law, in order to render the Church, and consequently the Nation, subservient to themselves.—5. That the Pope could not send his legate, even *a latere*, into France to reform, judge, collate, or dispense, except

with permission of the State.—6. That whenever such permission was granted, the Legate was obliged to swear that he would not, directly or indirectly, attempt any thing against the privileges of the Gallican Church.—7. That the Commissions and Bulls of Popes and Legates were to be examined, and approved by the Parliament, before they could exercise any Ecclesiastical functions whatever in France, and also to be registered and published, with such cautions, modifications, and restrictions, as the State deemed expedient, and *not otherwise*.—8. That the Papal Bulls, citations, sentences, censures, &c. were not to be executed without the King's leave, and then only in the name, not of the Pope, but of the King.—9. That neither the King nor his realm, nor any of his household or officers, could be indicted or excommunicated by the Pope.—10. That all the Prelates of France were to receive from the King their investitures for their fees and manors.—11. That no Bishop in France could depose any parish Priest, or any Priest who was *in possession* of any benefice, without a public

trial before the civil Magistrates, if that Priest chose to appeal; *as from abuse* of Episcopal power.

These are some of the principal articles of the Gallican liberties; and of truth, do they not of right belong to every National Church, and to all Sovereign States in their own Dominions? so that if the Sovereign State of this Country chose to enact them to-morrow, every subject would be obliged by his oath of allegiance to obey; otherwise independent Kingdoms would depend on others, and be destitute of remedies that are *necessary* for their preservation.

The confirmation of Bishops was generally, and during the space of twelve centuries, no more than the approbation given, by the Metropolitan and Suffragans of each Province, assembled in a Provincial Synod, to the free election of the Clergy of the vacant See. The Popes even disclaimed the right of confirming any Bishops except those of the Italian Provinces, which were immediately subject to them as

Metropolitans of Rome.* The learned *Thomasin*, whose authority is looked up to by all Catholics, expressly gives this as his *deliberate opinion*, after a most laborious and minute investigation of the subject,† and Van Espen, speaking of the Church of Utrecht, uses these remarkable words--

Manifeste igitur, uti opinor, demonstratum est, probari minime prætensam plenitudinem Potestatis Pontificiæ, per *modernam* praxim instituendi, confirmandi, et ordinandi Episcopos: quia tantum abest praxim hanc et morem ex primigenia Romani Pontificis, a Christo ipsi concessa auctoritate

* See Columbanus's Historical Address, Part ii.

† Quelque effort que nous ayons fait pour rechercher dans l'antiquité quelques traces de la police moderne de l'Eglise, qui a *presque* reserve au Pape seul l'élection et l'ordination de tous les Eveques, il a néanmoins paru, qu'au contraire, presque tous les anciens Eveques, sur tout dans les Patriarchats Orientaux, montoient sur le trône Episcopal, sans que le *Pape en fut meme averti*.

Quoiqt' apres leur ordination ils ecrivissent au Pape, pour temoigner leur union avec le centre de la communion Catholique, ce n'etoit nullement pour obtenir de lui la confirmation de leur dignite, et ce n'etoient meme que les Patriarches, les Exarques, et les Primats qui devoient entretenir ce Commerce de lettres avec l'Eglise de Pierre, qui est la source de l'unité. Tous les autres Eveques lui étoient unis par l'union qu'ils avoient avec leurs chefs." *Ancienne et Nouvelle Discipline*, t. 2; p. 720.

fluxisse, ut *potius contra primævam et constantem xi Sæculorum disciplinam*, fuerit introducta, nullis adjuta canonibus, sed *adversus antiquos canones*, non sine acerbis querimoniis Catholicorum virorum, *ipsorumque conciliorum*, quibus corderat veneranda antiquitas, et avita disciplina, quæ ex puro fonte profluxerat, et una summo dolori erant, gravissima incommoda et mala, quæ novam praxim comitabantur.

Ex quo ulterius consequitur, in Romani Pontificis auctoritate positum nequaquam fuisse, dare Ecclesiæ Ultrajectinæ merum *Vicarium*, sed ad illam, secundum sacros canones, ordinare debuisse proprium Pastorem et Episcopum, qui illam, non *Vicaria*, sed propria ac *Ordinaria* auctoritate regeret."

§ VIII. *Discipline of Trent.*

1. I know it has been objected, and ever will be objected, by those who look for the Ecclesiastical immunities, and aggrandizement of the 16th century, that the discipline of Trent reserves to the Pope *exclusively* the power of confirming Bishops, which formerly belonged to Provincial Synods and to the State. But I have elsewhere shewn, that those who have taken the *oath of allegiance*, by which they abjure all temporal power, *direct and indirect*, on the part of the Pope, in the British Islands, cannot, without perjury, receive the discipline of

Trent;* that that discipline was rejected by the Gallican Church, as hostile to the independence of the French nation; that the Spanish Netherlands formally rejected *six and forty* of its special decrees; and that the Spaniards themselves received it only on condition, that a caution should be formally promulgated against such parts of its discipline, as derogated from the independence of the Spanish Nation. †

Is it not universally acknowledged, that canons of discipline, even though enacted by general Councils, are not obligatory on any nation, until they are approved of, and received by that nation, and promulgated accordingly. ‡

* Columbanus's Historical Address, Part ii, p. 113.

Cardinal Perron's doctrine, that the Pope's power over the temporalities of States, and even his *deposing power*, was an article of faith for *eleven hundred years*, was maintained by the Jesuits in their college of Clermont, in Auvergne, in four public Theses or Disputations, June 26, 1683, notwithstanding the invincible arguments of James I. in his *Declaratio pro Jure Regio*. A clear proof that there are some persons, who can be restrained only by the Canons, and *strong arm of the law*.

† This is acknowledged even by Phillips in his time-serving life of Cardinal Pole, 4to. p. 411 and 419. Compare "*Jus Belgarum contra Bullas Pontificias*."

‡ "L' on a toujours cru qua la *promulgation* et l' *accepta-*

And when, or how, or where, or wherefore, or by whom, has the Council of Trent been promulgated in Ireland?—On this subject we are bound to inquire minutely into the *cur*, *quomodo*, *quando*; and I boldly assert, that no

tion des Loix Ecclesiastiques, etoit absolument necessaire, afin qu'elles pussent obliger en conscience; que les loix meme des Conciles Generaux, doivent etre publiques dans les Provinces pour avoir force de Loi." Dupin Traite de l' Excom. Biblioth. des auteurs du 18me Siecle, Paris 1736, t. 1, p. 48. Recueil des choses Memorables pour le fait de la Relig. 1563, t. 3. Extrait des Registres des Etats sur la reception du Concile de Trente an 1577, 1579, 1582, et 1585, and finally Richer's account of the Council of Trent in the fourth book of his History of General Councils, from p. 169 to 254.

It is plain from the collection of *Johannes Scholasticus*, the *Nomocanon of Photius*, and the *Codices Theodosii et Justiniani*, that the Fathers of all the primitive Councils petitioned the Emperors to confirm their canons of *discipline*. De Marca Concord. l. 4, c. 4, Launojus Ep. part 4, Ep. 1 et 2. Richer's History of Councils, l. 1. The Petition of the Nicene Fathers to this effect may be seen in Eusebius's Life of Constantine, l. 3, c. 18. The Fathers of Chalcedon followed the example of Nice, in their Petition to Theodosius, Socrat. Hist. l. 5, c. 8. The Imperial Edicts in reply, consider the right of confirmation as an indispensable act of Sovereignty. "*Oportet omnia juxta Dei beneplacitum discuti, ac tum demum a nostra pretate confirmationem obtinere.*" Imperial Edict addressed to the Council of Ephesus in the very Acts of that Council, Act vi. Harduin Concil, t. 1, p. 1539.

man will ever be able to shew that the discipline of Trent has been yet promulgated, either *with or without modifications*, by the Catholics of Ireland.

Our Protestant fellow subjects ought to be honestly informed, when they object to us the discipline of Lateran and of Trent, that there is nothing in the infallibility of Councils with respect to *discipline*, which can be considered binding on any national Church, except as far as that discipline has been received, or as far as it *re-enacts* the Canonical discipline, which was already consecrated by the veneration of the universal Church.—*Let us be candid.*—He who desires that others should deal fairly by him, ought to begin by acting fairly himself.

2. The discipline of the general Council of Basil was not received by France, until after long and violent discussion; and even then, of forty-five Sessions, France received only thirty-two, and these only with the various restrictions, which are specified in the Pragmatical Sanction. Pettyfogging equivocations are detestable in every transaction; in religion they

are atrocious; if there is a deeper damnation for one man than for another in the next life, and that there is all justice cries aloud, that damnation is for a Pope, or a Bishop, or a Priest, who, to serve his own ambitious purposes, equivocates in religion.

Dupin observes very justly that there are many enactments in the *Bulla Coenæ*, which are not received either in France, or in any other country in Europe, (except it may be in the Papal States,) although the Council of Trent seems to have approved the greater part of them.*

Pope Innocent I, writing to the Clergy of Constantinople, expressly declares that the Roman Church received no other canons than those of Nice; nor did that Church ever pretend to enforce the canons of any other than of

* "Il y a une infinité de cas dans la Bulle in Cœna Domini, qui ne sont recus ni en France, ni dans les autres Pays de la Chretienté, quoique le Concile de Trente semble en avoir approuvé plusieurs." Dupin Traite de l'excom. Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. du 18me siècle t. 1, p. 59.

the *four first general Councils* down to the end of the 10th century. *

Leo the Great, and his successors for 200 years, continually opposed the 28th canon of the general Council of Chalcedon, which has never been received by any of the western Churches, and is not, to this day, to be found in most of the MSS. or even of the printed collections; and as the Roman Church has uniformly rejected that 28th canon, so also has she consequently rejected the second of the second general Council of Constantinople, 80 years antecedent to that of Chalcedon; plainly

* The profession of faith made by Gerbert Archbishop of Rheims, at his consecration in 991, is published in the 10th vol. of the *Historiens des Gaulois*, by Dom. Bouquet, and the Benedictines of S. Maur, Paris, fol. 1760, p. 409.

In this he declares his assent only to the four first general Councils. “*Sanctas Synodos quatuor, quas Universalis mater Ecclesia confirmat, confirmo.*” The Benedictine note on this Profession is in these words—“*Sæculo x electi seu nominati Episcopi, formulam edebant confessionis, seu Professionis, in qua Conciliorum Generalium duntaxat quatuor mentionem faciebant; rectius inde forsitan concludit Rivetus noster, ab Ecclesia, sub finem etiam Sæculi x, quatuor duntaxat prima Concilia habita fuisse ut Generalia.*” *ib.*

evincing that the canons even of general Councils are not binding until they are received.

The disciplinal canons of the second general Council had not been received by any of the western Churches in the days of Gregory the Great, nor are they all received to this day. Those of Ephesus are much less so. They are not even inserted in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, which is that of the Roman Church.

3. Independently of legitimate promulgation, I have elsewhere shewn, that there are several other objections to the Trent discipline, which are insurmountable to all who take the *oath of allegiance* against that *direct*, or *indirect* power of the Pope over the temporalities of Kings.*

Even the temporizing sycophant Phillips acknowledges that that discipline reserves to the Pope *exclusively*, the cognizance of all Episcopal crimes, even of the highest delinquency.†

* Columbanus's Historical Address, Part ii, p. 113.

† Life of Cardinal Pole, 4to. ed. p. 411, and again 419. The Council goes so far as to enact, that if the cause be such as must *necessarily* be tried out of the Court of Rome, then it shall not be committed to any person, excepting such *Bishops* as the Pope *shall appoint*, that the commission to them shall

Pope Pius VI. insisted on this privilege in the case of the Diamond Necklace, and of the late Cardinal de Rohan. Now no person who receives this article, can be a loyal subject; and no one who takes the oath of allegiance can receive it *without being a perjurer!*

Again, the Council of Trent declares, Sess. 25, de Reform. that the immunities of the Clergy are of *Divine Institution*; and enacts “that the canons of all general Councils, as also all other Apostolic ordinances in favour of such immunities be *renewed, and exactly observed by all Catholics*, and that all Catholic Princes and States shall be *compelled* by the spiritual sword to enforce them.* Now this

be *special*, under the Pope’s hand and seal; and that he is not to give them more power than merely to ascertain facts, and institute a process, which they shall refer to the Pope, to whom the *definitive sentence* shall be reserved!

* “Cogantur omnes Principes Catholici conservare *omnia sancita*, quibus immunitas Ecclesiastica declaratur, a prædictorum Principum officialibus minime lædenda, sed bene conservanda nec permissuros ut officiales aut inferiores Magistratus, Ecclesiæ et personarum Ecclesiasticorum immunitatem, *Dei ordinatione* et canonicis sanctionibus constitutam, inconsideratione aliqua violent. *Decernit* itaque et præcipit

article equally tends to the overthrow of our Constitution.

It may be alleged that these immunities would no longer be claimed—but if so, then we give up the discipline of Trent.—Now the Vicars Apostolic inform us, *authoritatively*, that that discipline is as binding on Catholics as the doctrine of seven sacraments!

Let us look to facts. How did Vicars Apostolic avail themselves of this discipline, when last they were enabled to wield its thunders by the *circumstances of the times*?

Father Geoghagan's Immunities of Trent.

4. Athlone, the key of Connacht, had scarcely surrendered to Sir S. Coote, July 8, 1651, when

Sacros Canones et Concilia generalia omnia, nec non alias Apostolicas sanctitones, in favorem Ecclesiasticarum personarum, libertatis Ecclesiasticæ, et contra ejus violatores, editas; quæ omnia etiam præsentì Decreto innovat, exacte ab omnibus observari debere. Proptereaue admonet Imperatorem, Reges, Respublicas, Principes, et omnes et singulos cujuscumque status extiterint, ut quæ Ecclesiastici Juris sunt, tanquam Dei Præcepta, venerentur!" Sess. 25, c. 20. Can this be reconciled with our oath of allegiance?

Primate Reily called a provincial Synod to meet at *Clochuachter* on the 29th, where Father *Anthony Geoghagan*, who had lately arrived from Rome, with *instructions* to the Bishops, opened the Synod by proposing a decree, *which was adopted*; that no Bishop or Priest should sit in the general assembly of the nation, who had incurred the Nuncio Rinuccini's censures, unless he confessed the enormity of his guilt, and submitted to condign punishment, and *sacramental* absolution!

By a second decree, they declared the D. of Lorraine Protector of Ireland, excommunicating all Catholics, not excepting Lord Clanricard the King's Viceroy, who should dare to oppose this decree! Father Geoghagan then proposed an *oath of secrecy*, which was also received, the object of which was to overthrow Lord Clanricard's Government, and to vest it in themselves! Agents were then appointed to bring the other Provinces into this scheme.—The Bishops of Leinster assembled at *Balledrochid*, Sept. 1, and those of Connacht at *James-town* soon after, and united, with solemn ssu-

rances of 6000 men from the former, and 7000 from the latter, to support their designs!

All signed an act of excommunication against Clanricard and all his adherents, to be published as soon as their army was in sufficient strength to *disarm* his, with the help of their *spiritual* sword!

What was the result?—Why, that all Clanricard's efforts to assemble an army against the Regicides, were defeated by these Episcopal intrigues! that when Lord Castlehaven passed the Shannon with 1000 horse, on a design well concerted with Sir W. Dungan, to join him, Col. Bourke and Randal Mac Donnel pleaded Episcopal censures, and refusing to lead their 1500 foot to the rendezvous, left Castlehaven's flank exposed to Ireton and Waller, before whom he was compelled to retire! that this was the real source of all the subsequent calamities of the Catholics of Ireland! that Galway could have maintained a long siege, when invested by Sir C. Coote, in the beginning of the next year, 1652, had not the principal Officers, corrupted by these intrigues, re-

fused to receive aid from any others than the Episcopal party, who had resolved on suppressing the Royal authority by excommunication!

Father Geoghagan's letter to this effect, dated Galway, Feb. 4, and addressed to the Vicar General of Cluanmacnoise, was intercepted by Clanricard. The treason was evident; but this *sanctified traitor* pleaded the immunities of Trent;* application was made to his Ordinary, and a mock ineffectual trial was instituted by the Bishops!—Clanricard wrote to the Catholic Assembly, then sitting at Galway, that unless they vindicated the Royal authority, he would quit the kingdom. The Assembly interposed with the Prelates—In vain! Their reply was that *Geoghagan* was an Agent from the Court of Rome, and that his secrets could not be revealed even to the Lord Deputy! The Catholic Barristers of that day, more enlightened than the Poddle Plowdens and Clinches of our's, insisted that

* Nuncio's Memoirs, fol. 3225—3241. Columbanus's Historical Address, Part ii, p.

Geoghagan should be punished as a traitor. The Bishops in reply insisted on Ecclesiastical immunities.—The Lawyers urged that those immunities were repugnant to the fundamental laws of the land.—The sworn Delegates of the Roman Court replied that the *spiritual* sword is the sword of God, and they denounced vengeance against those who should dare to touch *one fibre* of its authority! The Chairmen of the Assembly ordered the Sheriffs to take Geoghagan into custody, but the Sheriffs *durst not execute the warrant!* *

This affair, says Carte, which the Compiler of the Nuncio's Memoirs takes out of Geoghagan's own relation, shews as well the pernicious designs of the Clergy, as how *impossible it is for the Royal authority* to subsist in countries, where such extravagant immunities are indulged! The town of Galway, soon after, by

* Carte Orm. vol. 2, p. 156. "This affair, says he, took up the month of Feb. 1652. On March 4, some letters from London, wrote by Crelly to Geoghagan, being brought to Clanricard, he laid them before the Assembly, and renewed his instances for punishing the criminal. But such was the power of the Clergy, that nothing was done in it."

the persuasion of the Warden and of the Nuncio's party, without *consulting the Lord Deputy*, surrendered to the Parliament rebels, who were amazed to see a place of that strength, with a Port, open at all times for supplies from abroad, so easily surrendered, at a time when the Irish had, in loose parties throughout the kingdom, more men in arms to defend it, than the English could have brought to invest the town. It surrendered on May 12, yet Clanricard, four days after took Ballyshannon, and held out for several months, endeavouring in vain to draw a sufficient number of forces together to fight the enemy!

5. Let us now return to other enactments of Trent.—One of them is that Bishops shall, without instituting any trial, be enabled to depose from his benefice any Clergyman, without assigning any cause or being answerable to any tribunal, if he knows, by auricular confession, or by any means, that that Clergyman is guilty of an *occult crime*—“*propter Crimen occultum.*” Now I appeal to every man whether this article be not diametrically repugnant to

the civil laws of our Country, which, by our oath of allegiance we are bound to uphold?

I shall go further—I maintain that it is repugnant to the ancient discipline of the Catholic Church! The seventh Council of Carthage, where S. Augustin personally attended, enacts that, even though a man confessed his crime to a Bishop, if he afterwards denied it, the Bishop is not to deem any injury done *him*, *if his single evidence be rejected*; and if the said Bishop should dare to excommunicate that man, whose crime he *privately knew*, he himself should be excommunicated. *

I will not enlarge on this subject farther than to observe that, amongst the many new laws enacted at Trent to establish the power of

* “Placuit, ut si quando Episcopus dicit, aliquem sibi soli proprium errorem fuisse confessum, atque ille neget, non putet ad injuriam suam Episcopus pertinere, quod ipsi soli, *non creditur*. Et si scrupulo propriæ conscientiæ se dicit neganti nolle communicare, *quamdiu excommunicato non communicaverit suis Episcopis, eidem Episcopo ab aliis non communicetur Episcopis*, ut magis caverit Episcopus, ne dicat in quenquam, quod *aliis documentis convincere nequit*.” See the same Canon repeated in Codice Africano, Can. 133 et 134, and in S. Aug. Hom. 16 de Verbis Domini.

Bishops, as *sworn Delegates of the Roman See*, it disposes of enfeodated tithes, that is, tithes which have been appropriated to Laymen, and retain nothing of spiritual, in such words as enable Bishops to apply one part of such tithes to the maintenance of colleges, without any appeal; * Now this article gives to Bishops, as *sworn Delegates of Rome*, not only *indirect*, but *direct* power over the lands of the Laity !

§ IX. *Irish Well-Miracles for the Doctrines of the Aulici Romani.*

1. I have elsewhere noticed the absurdity of the Vicar of Castabala's Pamphlet, in favour of the miracles of Druidic wells, and I have religiously abstained from questioning his motives, nor would I allude to them here—God being

* “ Etiam ex Decimis, *quocumque ratione* ad Laicos pertinentibus” !

Pope Eugene III. pretends indeed that all tithes are *spiritual* things, Cap. Literis Extrav. de juram, &c. But Chancellor Gerson has overwhelmed every idea of spirituality on this subject. Tract de Vita Spirit. By the Edicts of the French Kings, all disputes about tithes are of Lay Jurisdiction. Ordonance d' Henr. 3, a Melun 1580, Art. 29. Ord. de Charl. ix a Boulogne, 24 Juil, 1568. Ord. a Paris, April 18, 1571.

the only judge of the hearts of men, if I did not feel compelled by my duty, to expose such profanation, and to tell the whole truth.

Nothing can be more obvious than that the Divine *power* can never counteract the Divine *will*; and consequently that, if once a miracle is wrought in favour of Church immunities, Trent discipline, or of the maxims of the *Aulici Romani*, those immunities and maxims must be submitted to as Divine. If we admit the miracles, we must admit the doctrines for the sake of which they were wrought. But it is equally obvious that, before we come to this conclusion, we must ascertain the fact of miracle or imposture; and this is an inquiry, for which the bulk of mankind are no more qualified, than they are for inquiring into sorcery or divination. We find not only all Pagan, but all Christian nations consenting universally in the belief of witchcraft, and providing capital laws against Witches down to our own times!*

* See King James I. De Dæmonologia. Strype remarks, that the remonstrances of Bishop Jewel, and others of the Clergy, gave occasion to the Bill for making enchantments and

The pretended miracles in favour of Janse-
nism, which were wrought at the shrine of Abbe
Paris, * occasioned such a ferment in France,
that the very power of that Government, from
1725 to 1740, could hardly arrest the supersti-
tion of the populace, until the shrine was
inclosed within a wall with this inscription—

“ *De par le Roi—Defense a Dieu,*

“ *De faire des Miracles en ce lieu.*”

Every one knows what insidious attacks have
been made on Christianity itself, in conse-
quence of these abuses.—“ We must admit all
these miracles, say the Humes and Middletons,
or reject all.” Nor is this the only danger to be
apprehended from such cunning experiments.
There is also danger that persons interested in
these tricks, will avail themselves *piously* of
the credulity of the ignorant, to enforce *unjust*

witchcraft felony. Annals at the Reformat. v. 1, p. 8. See
the printed trials of 19 Witches who were condemned together
at Lancaster in 1612.

* Above 100 of those miracles were published in three
volumes, with the original vouchers of the principal Surgeons,
Physicians, &c. of Paris.

censures, which are dangerous to the morals, as well as to the loyalty of the people, and the tranquillity of the State!

Thus, at the very time when Father *Geoghan* insisted on Ecclesiastical immunities, and *Rinuccini's* censures, in 1652, his associate Father James *Finachty*, started in the capacity of a new Apostle, who was gifted with miraculous powers, by which those censures appeared to be ratified in heaven; and, as he was of the Nuncio's party, his pretended miracles were rendered instrumental to the discomfiture of his opponents.

2. Let us relate the miraculous history of this Impostor, for the instruction of the Irish people, so that they may learn to respect and to venerate rather the *genuine canonical laws* of the Catholic Church, than the arbitrary uncanonical censures of *false* Devotees.

Father *Finachty's* fame as a miracle-monger, had extended throughout every Province and every County in Ireland before the year 1657, for in the course of that year he is mentioned in a letter from Father Ward, an Irish Jesuite,

to Father Hughes, another Irish Jesuite, who was Chaplain to the Portuguese Resident in London, during the usurpation.

In that letter Father Ward states, “ that Finachty cured all manner of disorders, inso-much that he had often 1000, sometimes 1500, nay, 2 or 3000 persons in his train, who followed him through bogs, woods, and mountains; that Priests enough could not be had, though many followed to hear the confessions of the multitude, drawn to repentance by the prodigies he performed; and that therefore, as he was the greatest comfort to true Catholics, so was he a terror to *all manner of heretics.*”

With such a religious cry at his heels, who could dare to oppose *Father Finachty* in that ominous age? The Nuncio's opponents were so dashed down by his prodigies that they found silence their only security; nor does it appear that any man dared to raise his voice against this Impostor until after the restoration.

Then it was that, on Ormond's appointment to the Lieutenancy, Peter Walsh, making strict inquiries into his conduct, discovered that he

had, in many Parishes and Counties, *blessed wells* in the open fields; that he had given to those wells the names of Saints, in imitation of the holy wells of S. Patrick, S. Brigid, S. Winefred; that he affirmed that he had communicated to those wells a portion of his own efficacious supernatural power to cure diseases; that the people in Connacht, Leinster, and Munster, heaped gifts upon him, which he never refused; that he never shaped his course to Ulster, where the bulk of the people were Protestants; that, at Cluansallach, within five miles of Dublin, where he had come by appointment to cure diseases, so many from Dublin had crowded about him, that some were trampled to death; that several Protestants had gone there to see him perform his wondrous cures, but, instead of being converted, they returned disappointed and vexed; that he never attempted any cure except where great multitudes were assembled, and on such as he himself selected out of the crowd; that his manner was to exorcise and blow most vehemently into the ears of the diseased; and—finally—that no

cure was wrought by him which could, *bona fide*, be deemed miraculous.

Amongst the well-informed Catholics who gave credit to some of his pretended cures, were *Geoffry Brown* and *Sir Richard Belling*, the former a Counsellor at law, the latter a man of the highest respectability, for his exemplary conduct throughout the whole of the civil wars. To those Walsh eagerly addressed himself for more minute information; and, to his astonishment, even Belling informed him, that Finachty had a wonderful gift from God of curing by exorcism and prayer.—“*Well*, said Walsh, *but you have been with him at Cluansallach, and touched for the cure of the gout, and prayed for there, and yet you have had the gout once or twice since.*”

Belling answered in the affirmative, but yet that his gout was not *as painful* as formerly, and that he would refer him for further proofs to *Geoffry Brown*.

Brown's account was that he was present, when two or three hundred persons had assembled in a wood in Connacht, amongst whom

was a well known cripple, going upon all-fours, only having two low crutches, not above half a foot high, under his hands; that in his presence, and in that of the whole multitude, Finachty, having exorcised the cripple, ordered him to stand up, which the cripple refusing to do, he then ordered one of his assistants to raise and hold him up *by force, stretched up for some time*; that the cripple cried out vehemently he was *in torture*, and not able to continue so stretched; that then Finachty had him laid down as before, and after exorcising him a second time, had him raised up again on his legs, when the cripple felt no more pain and walked upright; that, on *the next Sunday*, he appeared publicly at a *hurling match*, perfectly cured, so as to run bolt upright, with as much activity and strength as any other of his age! “This happened, sayed Brown, many years ago, in the Protector’s time, and this is all I know of his cures, nor can I positively affirm that that was a miracle.”

Soon after these inquiries, *Belling* moved the

Lord Lieutenant to permit Finachty, by a pass, to travel as usual, and practise even in Dublin! Ormond replied, that “if Finachty came to Dublin, and performed but one miracle, *he shall lye even in my own bed here in the Castle*—But look you Mr. Belling, instead of acquiring honour, and converting Protestants, by exposing Finachty to more narrow searchers than those who are *willing to be deceived*, you will make him an object of scorn, and yourselves of laughter for your credulity.”

This answer produced the effect that Ormond recommended, and nothing more was heard of Finachty for twelve months after; when, to Walsh’s astonishment, he was informed by various letters from London, that Finachty was there, and had performed wonderful cures at the Portuguese Chapel, and even at the Queen’s at S. James’s, before all the world, both Protestants and Catholics, giving sight to the blind, and raising such a ferment that the Government thought it wise to send him, with an English Catholic Gentleman, J. D. E. in a coach

and six, to Oxford, Chester, and so on to Holyhead, and Dublin, where he landed soon after with the *Lord Dillon* and *Garrot Moore*.

After his arrival, Walsh discovered that he had been sent for to London by a Portuguese Lady, who lived with the Queen, who had lost her sight, and was informed of his miracles, by *Hughs* the Jesuit, already mentioned; and that this Lady, or the Queen, had employed Father *Teig Mac Eochuy* to go for him to Ireland.* Walsh inquired of *Mac Eochuy* whether the blind Lady was cured?—"No, said the
"other, it is a scandalous business!—Much
"money and trouble to no purpose!—And yet,
"after all, *Finachty* is now pretending in Rome,
"to the bishopric of Elphin!" Soon after this, *Finachty* was invited by the *Earl of Fingal*, and thither was he followed by a Lancashire woman, who was said to be a demoniac, and

* This *Mac Eochuy*, who went also by the name of *Captain Power*, was an Irish Dominican, of Dr. Troy's order, and (probably on account of his trouble in proceeding to Ireland on this occasion) was, by the Queen's recommendation, appointed Bishop of Clonfert, in 1671.

whom he publicly announced, that he would cure at *Lord Fingal's* house, in the presence of all descriptions of people.

30 We may guess to what a state of imbecility and superstition the minds of Irishmen were degraded, by the vile maxims of the Rinuccini Censuring school, when we consider that hundreds of persons assembled at Lord Fingal's on this occasion, under a thorough conviction of his success! that one of the principal promoters of this pious work was Father Peter Talbot, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, in Lord Tyrconnel's administration, who had written the *Friar Disciplined* against Walsh, and had been foremost in the persecution of the Catholic Remonstrants, from 1662! that to Lord Fingal's he had the weakness to conduct the *Marchioness of Antrim*, for the purpose of converting her by miracle to the Catholic faith! that for this purpose he stipulated with Finachty that he should expel the devil "*in signo visibili*," by a visible sign! that Finachty engaged so to do; and after much blowing, and many adjurations, the devil keeping fast hold of his prize, all the people

departed in extreme confusion, the Protestants scoffing, the Catholics inexpressibly chagrined!

3. How came it that this vile impostor, many of whose tricks shame and indignation prevent my recording, succeeded thus far in imposing on the whole Irish nation? Countrymen, read the miracles that are daily propagated by false Devotees, read those of the Roman Breviary, those of the pictures opening their eyes, and recollect that authority maintained with arrogance, ever renders its subordinate slaves the vile and venal instruments of gloomy superstition. The conduct of a people so governed, will never be rational, sober, or dignified. Systems of education tend not only to form the habits of individuals, but to determine the character of *nations*. There is no sphere of action in which the influence of education does not extend, whether we refer to public taste, to public manners, or to religion.

The Roman Court party countenanced and extolled Finachty, because he was one of themselves. The Remonstrants, finding themselves maligned as schismatics, and that *Finachty's* authority with the populace had been rendered

instrumental to their ruin, were afraid to oppose him. Uncanonical censures, and a tumultuary, besotted, ignorant populace on one side, left them in a great minority on another; and the vilest maxims of Roman Court sycophantism, miracle-monging, and arbitrary plenitude of power, * triumphed over the good sense, and the religion of the Irish Nobility and Gentry from *Rinuccini's* days to our own.

* Those who pretend that the discipline of Trent grants to the Pope this arbitrary plenitude are much mistaken.—The words of the Council, even where it grants the Pope a power of dispensing in the Canons, are—

“*Sciant universi Sacratissimos Canones exacte ab omnibus, et quoad fieri poterit, indistincte observandos. Quod si urgens, justaque ratio, et major, quandoque utilitas postulaverint, cum aliquibus dispensandum esse, id causa cognita, ac summa maturitate, atque gratis, a quibuscumque, ad quos Dispensatio pertinebit, erit præstandum; aliterque facta dispensatio subreptitia censeatur.*” Upon these words Natalis Alexander observes—“*Tantum abest* ut Concil. Tridentinum Romani Pontificis voluntati omnia permittat.—Hac Tridentini Concilii lege tenentur et ipsi Romani Pontifices.” Hist. Eccl. Sæc. 16; t. 8, p. 700.

Now let this be compared with the extraordinary pretensions, *even against justice*, which are claimed in the present Pope's Bulls “*Qui Christi Vices*,” and “*Ecclesia Christi* :” and be it remembered that both these Bulls have been extolled and received by the Irish Synod of Tullow!

See Columbanus's Historical Address, Part ii, p. 27.

Such are the maxims, such the principles, such the *practices*, on account of which, Columbanus is, forsooth, excluded from the benefits of *Redemption*, because he dare to expose them to the horror and indignation of his country!

Conclusion.

On that tremendous day, when the accounts of men are to be settled by a sentence which shall close for ever the gates of time, Vicars Apostolic shall be ranged, like other people, on the right, or on the left! Then shall be seen traced on their faces, in awful characters, the word *Eternity*, and on their breasts, *Justice*!

The inquiry which will then be instituted, is not whether, with blind, *undiscerning* subserviency, we obeyed all the commands of our superiors, but whether we obeyed their *just* commands, in compliance with certain principles of *moral rectitude*, which have been sculptured in legible characters, on our hearts.— Then will it be idle to palliate the commission

of any act, which we *know* to be *unjust*, or the *omission* of any which we are bound to perform, by alleging the order of a Father Confessor for the *commission* of the one, or his dispensation for the omission of the other.

Catholics of the British Islands! I now appeal to yourselves whether you *do not know* that it is an act, not only of injustice, but of *injustice and sacrilege* united, a *schismatical* violation of the laws of the Church, to deny the sacraments, which have been sprinkled with the blood of our Saviour for the remission of sin, thereby excluding from the benefits of the Christian Religion, any man who not only is *not convicted of any heresy, immorality, or schism*, but who has not even been *heard in his own defence*, and who solemnly protests his willingness to *retract*, if any uncatholic or immoral doctrine can fairly be proved against him. *You know* that it is a crime, which excludes from the book of life, to caluminate the orthodoxy of any man, and then to condemn and exclude him from the benefits of the Christian religion for *that very calumny*, which originates in the

wounded pride, and spiritual resentment, of the very persons who thus execute revenge on *Columbanus*, for daring to expose the *abuses* of their jurisdiction.

I do not here call upon you to judge of a *speculative* opinion. The question is a question of *fact*. Have not the sacraments been rendered instrumental to *political* revenge against *Columbanus*, without allowing him even a hearing, or a just liberty of defence? without his pleading *guilty* or *not guilty*? without any heretical or schismatical proposition selected from his works? nay, more, with a *positive refusal* to specify any such proposition?

Will you then allege, as an excuse for compliance with *sacrilegious* orders, that you have been commanded *in confession*?—*You know* that this will only aggravate the guilt, because, against the clearest conviction of *fact*, you not only consent to the sacrilege, but you attempt to justify it on pretence of *religion*!

Does not your very catechism for children mark the distinction of obedience to superiors

and Pastors in their *just commands*? Do not the Sunday Litanies make the same distinction? Even oaths cease to be binding, when they are found to be *unjust*. If blind obedience were to be the test of religion, we must travel for religion to Mecca; if the *mere command* of a superior, is to be the *rule of right*, the Law and the Prophets, the very principles of moral obligation, are at an end.

Why does S. Paul preach the doctrine of *rational* obedience, but to prevent the *abuse* of authority?—Why are the Laity as well as the Clergy ordered to obey God rather than man?—S. Paul declares that Calumniators shall never enter the kingdom of heaven; and men are guilty of calumny by every *omission*, as well as by every act which gives currency to slander, nay, even by *silence*, if that silence implies a confirmation of the report. Now, will those who are guilty of not opposing, as far as they can, the propagation of calumny, or the persecution of truth, justify themselves in the eye of God, by alleging orders in sacramental con-

fession? Would they obey such orders were *their own* characters compromised, for *their own* interests at stake? *but none over you

3. There are persons possessed of much external devotion, who gradually proceed to make a false conscience to themselves, extinguishing the light of reason, and silencing the admonitions of conscience, when their pride is involved, or their interests are engaged in the contest. Take care!—Time flies! and the all-seeing eye of God will *judge rightly*. He will pronounce eternally, according to the *rules of truth and justice*, which he has engraved upon our hearts, and his voice has declared that the man who is not for him *is against him!*

* “C’est un pretexte que l’on allègue pour s’exempter de soutenir la verité que l’on doit *obeir aux Superieurs!* Leur fait on honneur en les preferant a la verite? Ne scait on pas cette regle, *posee par la verité eternelle*—il vaut mieux obeir a Dieu qu’aux homes? Un autre pretexte est le peu d’esperance de reussir contre le *torrent di la multitude*. Mais si l’on ne reussit pas, on doit au moins le tenter. Dieu ne demande pas le succes; mais il exige que chacun *fasse son devoir*, et ce qui est de devoir est toujours *d’obligation*.” Dupin Traite de la verite. Compare my title page.

Catholic Pastors, of the British Islands—allow an humble individual to address you—

You have seen the sacraments abused to purposes of human policy, and in the confidence of friendship, you whisper that you do not like such doings.—Why then not speak out?—Why not protest against these *abuses* with the virtue which your calling so imperiously requires? Why not exhort in season and out of season? You have not indeed stood foremost in defence of injustice; but the Watchman who stands a silent spectator of robbery, and springs not his rattle, participates in the guilt of the offender. Are you not the *light* of the world? Are you not the *salt* of the earth? You have seen the vilest maxims of *Ultramontaniam* espoused as articles so *essential* to Catholicity, that the rejecting of them is declared sufficient to justify *exclusion from the sacraments*! You have seen the Church, in which you have been baptized, saddled with those maxims, and consequently reproached and blasphemed by the surrounding Sects!

4. Fearless of the face of man, I have shewn

that a Catholic may, with *Bossuet, Dupin, Natalis Alexander*, and the assertors of the Gallican Liberties, oppose these maxims without being the less a Catholic. Through good and through evil report, I have resisted the reprehensible man to his face. It is true that for this I have been calumniated as a schismatic! But will any one say that the Gallican Church was schismatical? that those were not Catholics who stood firm against Rinuccini's censures, from 1646 to the revolution? Amongst those were hundreds of Priests of the second order, and some Bishops, with a majority of the Nobility and Gentry of Ireland! Were they schismatics? Were the Loyal Remonstrants schismatics, notwithstanding the excommunications fulminated against them by the Court of Rome? Were those schismatics who subscribed King James's oath, in defiance of Cardinal Bellarmine, the Jesuits, and the condemnation of Pope Paul V?

Were those Parliaments Schismatical which enacted the several laws against Roman Court influence, to which I refer at the bottom of this

page.* Was *William Wormington*, Cardinal Allen's Chaplain, a schismatic, when, having been committed to the Clink prison, March 24, 1607, and released on his taking James's oath, he was calumniated as an *apostate*, who had been entertained by the Bishop of Winchester, and pensioned by Government? † Was the English Benedictine *Preston* a schismatic, when, under the assumed name of *Widrington*, he published, in English and Latin, his excellent Defence of James's Oath, against the Bulls of condemnation repeatedly issued by Pope Pius V? or when, in defence of the same oath, he wrote his excellent *Appcal*, in Latin, to Pope Gregory XV, dated from the Clink prison, London, 29 Maii, 1621. ‡

* These Laws are 25 Edw. I. 25 Edw. III. c. 23. 27 Edw. III. c. 1. 13 Rich. II. c. 2. 2 Hen. IV. c. 3 and 6, c. 1 and 7, c. 8 and 11. 9 Hen. V. c. 4.

† Dodd, vol. ii, p. 376. The proceedings of the Mitre-hunters against Columbanus are of a similar description, and are equally contemptible. "*Calumniators shall never enter the kingdom of heaven.*" S. Paul.

‡ Augustæ apud Baptistam Fabrum 1621.

Surely you cannot be ignorant that the Bull *Unam Sanctam* of Pope John XXII, the whole sixth book of the Decretals of Pope Boniface VIII, all the Canons published by Pope Gregory IX, in his fifth book of Decretals, which contain many things derogatory to the temporalities of sovereign and independent States, and National Churches, all were rejected by the Catholic Churches of France, Spain, Venice, the Spanish Netherlands, by Mentz, though it was an Ecclesiastical Principality,* and this too, notwithstanding the awful solemnity of its annual publication at the Vatican, every Maunday-Thursday, the Pope himself reading it in his Pontificals, and concluding the Lecture by throwing down his *burning torch*, and quenching it, in token of everlasting damnation to all those, who dared to resist its twenty-seven excommunications, each of which

* Pithou de libertat. Eccl. Gall. t. 3, part 4 and 6, Caron's *Remonstrantia Hibernorum*. Append. 1. Tract de libert. Eccl. Gall. § 2, No. 37. The Liber 7mus Decretalium was only the compilation of a private individual, *Petrus Maffæus*, a Canonist of Lyons.

branches out into as many more, the absolution from each being reserved to the Pope exclusively, except *in articulo mortis!** and that to *our own times?*

When Philip II. heard that the Pope's Nuncio had affixed that Bull to the Church door at Caligaris, a city of Biscay, he commanded him to be thrust into a coach, with all his implements of excommunication, and tinkerism of pretended religion, and packed back to Pope Gregory XIII, with a letter of bitter reproach in his own hand:† and yet this and the *Unigenitus* Bull are enforced by Censures in Ireland!

When Ferdinand, of Arragon, heard from his Viceroy at Naples, that the Pope's Messenger had delivered in Censures to the prejudice of his Sovereignty, he returned a sharp answer to the Viceroy, for not having *hanged* the Messenger, with a peremptory declaration, that if the Pope did not immediately revoke his Brief, he would withdraw from all further dependance

* Jus Belgar. No. 16.

† Ibid.

on Rome with respect to Benefices and Bishoprics. This letter is dated Burgos, May 22, 1508.*

The Pragmatical Constitution published for Naples by Philip II, Aug. 30, 1561, ordains that no Papal Bull however published at Rome, even with the clause "that publication at Rome shall be binding on all Catholic States," shall be received without his permission, and this ordinance has been ever since observed with respect to the *Bulla Cænæ*. †

5. In short, I am one of those many Catholics who grieve to see Protestants estranged from us by the revival of the vilest transalpine maxims, as if the government of our Church by *plenitude of power*, and *motives in petto*, resembled the Government of the Dey of Algiers! I grieve to see the Protestant disgusted, the Catholic disgraced, and the benevolence of a Christian Legislature obstructed, which, long ere now, would have thrown open to us the gates of the Empire, had not such vile maxims interposed,

* Jus Belgar. ib. Sum. 3, No. 12. Borellus de præstantia, Regis Cathol. p. 545, Caron, p. 236, 267. † Ib.

shewing them that the Catholic Religion is perverted into a system of human *policy*, that the sacraments are prostituted, and sacramental confession rendered subservient to designs of worldly policy and Episcopal intrigue.

English Protestants, be not scandalized! *you know* that the *Scriptures* are abused, as well as the sacraments! Remember that celebrated passage from the book of Maccabees, with which I closed my *Historical Address*—"I beseech those who will read this book, that they be not shocked at these calamities, but consider them, not as being for the destruction, but for the correction of our people."

6. I now again submit my writings not only to the judgment of the Universal Church, but even to a free Synod of the Western, called the Latin, nay, even to a *free* National Synod, composed of the first and second orders of the Hierarchy, deliberating *publicly* before all the Church, as in the first Council of Jerusalem, each Clergyman solemnly declaring "*tactis Sacrosanctis Evangeliiis*," that in the judgment he is about to give, touching *heresy* or *schism*,

he will be governed by *no worldly motives*; and each declaring whether Dr. Poynter has not violated the universal laws of the Catholic Church, and committed consequently a schismatical act, by excluding from the benefits of the Christian sacraments, a Clergyman whose heresy and schism, which, even if it could be pointed out, might be *unintentional*, remains yet to be proved!

I solemnly declare myself to be, what I have ever been, from my infancy, and from my heart, a sincere and obedient son of that old Church, which, throughout a period of 1000 years, planted, watered, and cultivated Christianity amongst our ancestors; which erected our most venerable edifices; preserved our ancient manuscripts; founded our Universities; left a thousand monuments of Christian piety scattered over the face of our Island; and for the last 800 years, whilst it was the religion of the State, repeatedly *protested*, and even enacted laws against the uncanonical proceedings, and haughty pretensions of the *sworn Delegates* of

Rome; for instance, at the *Assizes of Clarendon*, under Henry II; at the *Parliament of Carlisle*, under Edward I; that of *Westminster*, under Edward III; by the Statute of *Præmunire*, under Richard II; and by the several Statutes against foreign influence, under Henry IV and V.

Countrymen! I conclude with the following passage from Bossuet—

“Piety does not consist in pompously exaggerating the privileges which have been granted to the Holy See! as if that See stood in need of such *political* artifices. It does not consist in applying magnificent titles to the Pope, which, when closely examined, vanish before the eye of inquiry, and yet afford to the enemies of the Church ample matter for calumny, lay snares for the ignorant, afford pretexts for demanding extraordinary dispensations,* annihilating the canons, enfeebling the discipline

* Such was the dispensation granted to the late Bishop Butler to receive the sacrament, even whilst he continued in the public profession of apostacy! Columbanus, No. v.

of the Church, and destroying all hopes of *restoring that discipline again*. Let us never consider as truly pious, any practices or principles, which are not consistent with *truth*, and the ancient tradition of the Church!" *

* "*La piété ne consiste pas à enfler et à exagérer les privilèges accordés à la chaire de Pierre, comme s'ils avoient besoin de cet artifice. Elle ne consiste pas à inventer des titres, magnifiques, qui, des qu'on les explique, s'évanouissent en fumée, et cependant fournissent aux Ennemis de l'Eglise une ample matière à la Calomanie, tendent des pièges aux ignorans, donnent des prétextes pour demander, contre les règles, des dispenses extraordinaires, et même pour les obtenir par surprise, ce qui n'est propre qu'à anéantir les Saints Canons, à enlever la rigueur de la Discipline, et à ôter, pour toujours, l'espérance de la voir rétablir. Ne regardons jamais comme véritablement pieux que ce qui sera conforme à la vérité et à la tradition !*" Bossuet Defense, t. 2, p. 560. "Ce qui est mal, ne cesse pas d'être mal parce que le Pape y consent." S. Bernard de Considerat. Ibid.

Longe magis consentaneum est pro regula sectari, quod Ecclesiæ placuit, et per *duodecim Sæcula* observatum est quam quod *quinque* posterioribus Sæculis Ecclesia toleravit, atque emendare satagit. Fleury Præf. ad Instit. Juris. Eccl. Paris 1768. Compare Bossuet's words on my title page.

FINIS.

of the Church and destroying all hopes of
 seeing that discipline again. Let us never

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS,

which are not consistent with truth

and the ancient tradition of the Church!

Referred to in these Sheets.

1799.

WHEN the union was in contemplation, in 1799, the Irish Government made a private proposal to the Trustees of Maynooth College, for an independent provision for the Catholic Clergy. I, for one, would have hearkened to such proposals with great good will.—In some few Parishes, the Catholic Priests' stipend is fully adequate to the subsistence of a single individual, but even in those it is very fluctuating and precarious, and it is obtained by nasty, mean, solicitations, which degrade the ministry, and debase the mind. I do not therefore blame the ten Irish Bishops who assembled in Dublin, Jan, 17, 18, 19, and 28, to deliberate on this subject; but they were extremely reprehensible in coming *privately* to any determination, without the *consent*, or *knowledge* of the persons chiefly concerned, the Parochial Clergy of Ireland; and they were unpardonable in resolving, not only without their knowledge, but against their immemorial rights and usages; claiming the *right of election* entirely to themselves!

Resolved, say they, that, in the appointment of Prelates to vacant Sees within the Kingdom, such interference of Government, as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person appointed, is just, and ought to be agreed to; that to give this principle its full operation, without infringing the

discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, or diminishing the religious influence, which Prelates of that Church ought justly to possess over their respective flocks, the following regulations seem necessary.—1st. In the vacancy of a See, the Clergy of the Diocese to recommend, as usual, a Candidate, to the Prelates of the Ecclesiastical Province, who elect him, or any other they may think worthy.”

Then follow other Resolutions, the 4th of which is,—“*The Candidates so elected to be presented by the President of the election to Government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of the said Candidate, if no objection be made against him, for appointment to the Holy See.*”

These Resolutions were kept a profound secret, and very privately forwarded by the four Archbishops to Lord Castle-reagh, Dublin Castle; nor was this *secret* discovered, until it betrayed itself through the inconsistency of Dr. Milner, when he proposed the Veto in 1807. Thus it appears that *private* Synods ought to be abolished, even for the sake of the Bishops themselves; because they expose the Episcopal character to suspicion, and to *guilt*, “*Qui male agit odit Lucem.*” There are several letters of Dr. Troy’s extant, one of which is now before me, in which he entreats that this transaction may not be made known! On private Synods, see above, p. 80.

1800.

Pope Pius VII. writes to Lewis XVIII, March 14, 1800, acknowledges him legitimate Sovereign of France, successor of S. Lewis; communicates to him as such, the intelligence of his election to the Popedom, and expresses towards him the most *unfeigned*, and inviolable attachment.

1801.

Pius VII. issues his Decree, dated Rome, Aug. 15, demanding of the French exiled Bishops, in the space of *ten days* at

farthest, to resign their Sees to him, on pain of being deposed by a Concordatum with Buonaparte, which the exigency of the times (or time-serving) induced him to sign.

He publishes his Bull, "*Ecclesia Christi*," dated Rome, 18 Kal. Sept. in which he uses these expressions.—

"We order that these enactments, meaning the Concordat with Buonaparte, shall never be controverted, or charged with any fault or informality, but shall be for ever valid, and be inviolably observed, all Synods and Councils, General or Provincial, notwithstanding, and also all Laws and Constitutions against depriving of rights or privileges, each of which we specially and expressly abrogate and annul."

The Pope issues his Bull, "*Qui Christi Domini Vices*," dated Rome, 3 Kal. Decemb. in which he says—"We derogate from the consent of all the legitimate Archbishops, Bishops, Chapters, and Pastors of France, and do hereby depose them, interdicting them for ever, from all jurisdiction in their respective Churches; and we order that these enactments shall never be controverted for any fault whatever, even though it should be a very considerable fault, which we might not have foreseen, but that they shall have full and entire effect to all intents and purposes, all Synods and Councils, General and Provincial, notwithstanding; even though any person or persons of any degree, order, or pre-eminence, either Lay or Ecclesiastic (including of course the rights of the Royal Family) should object their just rights, or that they have not given their consent, or that they have not been cited to appear, or have not been directly or indirectly heard, or any cause whatever, even of injustice, however grievous it may be supposed, though it should be substantial, and very substantial, or that the proper forms of law have not been observed, which ought to have been observed, or because reasons for this proceeding have not been sufficiently alleged—We order that no reason, *de jure* or *de facto*, just or unjust, shall be alleged

against them, but that, having been issued by our Pontifical Providence, and emanated motu proprio, from the plenitude of our power, they shall for ever remain, in the most incontrovertible manner, valid and immutable."

The Pope publishes the *Concordatum*, dated April 10, 1801, by which he absolves all Frenchmen from their oaths of allegiance to their legitimate Sovereign, consenting to the oath to Buonaparte, by which all Bishops and Parish Priests swear that they will bear true allegiance to him, and reveal all conspiracies against his Government.

By this *Concordat*, 146 Episcopal and Metropolitan Sees were suppressed; of 48000 Parish Priests 6000 only were allowed to remain; of 146 Chapters of Cathedrals only 66; Seminaries, Monasteries, Asylums for the Poor, for Widows, Orphans, penitential old age, all were suppressed! the most venerable men of the Gallican Church were deposed without any form of judicature, without a hearing, without a crime, and thrown for subsistence on the pelting storms of an infidel and merciless Usurpation! The Pope's words are—"Consensimus, ut Episcopi, antequam Episcopale munus gerendum suscipiant, coram primo Consule juramentum fidelitatis emittant..... Consensimus ut Parochi," &c.---Thus, in less than one year after he had acknowledged Lewis XVIII, he acknowledged Buonaparte!--From my infancy I have been taught the following maxim—"Fait ce que tu dois, avoient que pourra"—*recusare debes, etiam cum vitæ discrimine, et ultinâ quæque pati, potius quam inhonesto vinculo obligare caput.*

1802,

The Abbe Blanchard publishes an animated and argumentative work against the *Concordat*, in favour of the Gallican Liberties, and the House of Bourbon, for which he receives the thanks of the exiled Bishops in England and Germany.

The exiled Bishops of France, residing in England, publish their *Memoire* against the *Concordat*. London 1802.

A PROPHEPIC WARNING.

I mention Blanchard's book, not only on account of the solidity of his principles, in defence of the *canonical* discipline of the Catholic Church, which Pius VI. endeavoured to the last to maintain, but also because I observe in it the following words at page 108.—“With respect to the Pope's temporal Dominions I wish not to touch on that subject. His temporal Dominions are a mere nothing when compared with the rules of Ecclesiastical discipline, which are overturned by the Concordat; and really is the Pope certain that he will be able to preserve those Dominions by the sacrifice of the laws of the Church? No,—I forewarn him that the deposition and spoliation of the French Bishops, to which he has so unjustly consented, will be visited on his own head. He will be deprived of his temporal Dominions.”

This Prophecy was verified in 1809!

1803, APRIL 6.

The French exiled Bishops publish their *Appeal* against the Pope's *Concordat*, and transmit it in Latin to the Pope.

1804, NOVEMBER 2.

Buonaparte prevails on the Pope to pass the Alps and to crown him at Paris—“*Hæc omnia tibi dabo, si cadens adoreris me.*”---This *sacred* ceremony is solemnly performed on the first Sunday of Advent, 1804.

The French exiled Bishops publish a Translation of their *Appeal* from the Concordat, which is signed by 38 Bishops and Archbishops.

Lord Redesdale's correspondence, of the year 1803, with Lord Fingal, is published by Jeffrey, Pall Mall, and in the

Annual Register, with this note inserted at page 27. "The *recommendation* of Successors to Catholic Bishoprics in Ireland, is in the *Bishops of the Province*."

N.B. I notice this as the first *public avowal* of such an assumption of power. The first *private* is that of 1799.

1805, MAY 10.

I can never forget the impressive tone, and manner, in which Lord Grenville declared, in his speech on the Catholic Question, that the system pursued towards Ireland, was calculated to keep the great mass of the people in the vilest ignorance, debasement, and poverty, and proportionably to exasperate their minds against England, and attach them to France. He moved that the House should resolve itself *into a Committee to consider the Catholic Petition*.

1805, MAY 26.

Buonaparte is crowned King of Italy, by the Pope's Legate, Cardinal Caprara, Archbishop of Milan, who presents to him a Letter of Congratulation from the Pope, dated Rome, May 20.

1805, JUNE 26.

The Pope addresses a pompous Allocution to the Consistory of Cardinals at Rome, in praise of his *dear son in J. C. Napoleon*, and on the advantages derived and *expected* from his having, with *holy and solemn* rites, celebrated the *sacred* coronation of that Emperor, and of his *excellent Sposa*, the Empress Josephine---"*Sacro* solemnique ritu, *consecratio* peracta est." Thus did he vainly hope to save his temporal dominions, at the expence of the *Laws* of the Catholic Church, forgetting, alas! that *honesty is the best policy* man can pursue.

1805.

The Vicar of Castabala publishes a Defence of the Pope against the Abbe Blanchard; and, in vindication no doubt of *his own* principles, he publishes also *his Miracles of S. Winefrid*.—"It is well known, says he, *amongst Catholics*, "that such miraculous events are by no means unfrequent. I "myself know *two or three* persons who have been the subjects of them, I know a *family* in which *five or six*," &c.

Good reader! compare *Father Finachty's* miracles at page 162 of these sheets, with Columbanus's No. iii, on *Well-worshipping*, and his *Historical Address*, p. 30, and you will find that, *by Catholics* who attest such miracles, he means only *those Catholics* who maintain the *political* maxims of the Roman Court, masked by the words Catholic Religion.

1806.

The Abbe Blanchard publishes his *Etat Politique et Religieux de la France*, in defence of the exiled French Bishops, against the uncanonical proceedings of the Court of Rome, in which he argues, that the Pope has violated the most sacred laws of the Catholic Church, and that the French Bishops cannot yield to such *unjust* and *schismatical* proceedings, without treason and schism.

1808, MAY 25.

The Parliamentary friends of the Catholics, the persons to whom they look up with the greatest respect, as men of powerful abilities, probity, and virtue, stated in both Houses of Parliament, that they were *authorized by Dr. Milner*, then accredited Agent for the Irish Bishops, to concede to Government a *negative* in the nomination to Irish Sees; nor was any opposition to this measure manifested, *on the part of the said Bishops*, until the 14th of September following.

1808, MAY 27.

LORD GRENVILLE'S SPEECH.

I witnessed the following expressions from Lord Grenville on the Catholic Question.—“ It is above all things desirable that this great measure be fully and deliberately investigated, that it be not a hasty and *inconsiderate concession*, on which the pressure of the times shall stamp the character of weakness, but that you may maturely consider *with what measures* it ought to be accompanied, what course of policy is necessary to render it beneficial, and what *new safeguards* its adoption may require. It is unquestionably proper that the Crown should exercise an *effectual negative* over the appointment of Irish Catholic Bishops. To this the Irish Catholics declare themselves *perfectly willing to accede*. It formed a part of the plans intended to be brought forward at the period of the Union, (see above, page 190,) and what we then knew of the sentiments of the Catholics respecting it, *left no doubt upon our minds* that the matter might be easily and satisfactorily arranged. In all matters of *Civil Government*, even of that *mixed nature* in which Ecclesiastical and Civil Jurisdictions are combined, they submit themselves without reserve, to the supreme authority of the State. In a Committee you may bring this matter to the unerring test of experience. With this view, it was intended, at the period of the Union, to submit to Parliament, in lieu of the *oath of supremacy*, a new oath, calculated to unite our people. We should then see whether the Irish Catholics would be *reluctant to concur*. I know that the Catholic practice of excommunication is objected. But this practice can be applied to *spiritual* matters only. Have there been attempts to extend it further?—Permit no such interference with the temporal interests of your people. Prohibit it by your laws, and if prohibition be found ineffectual, *punish it*.”

Such was the language of the greatest Advocate the Catholic Cause has had since the Reformation---and it was highly applauded by our Gentry and Nobility. But the foreign influenced Vicars, and *sworn Delegates*, whose *undefined* spiritual powers would, by such principles, be restrained within Canonical bounds, soon began to exert their power against such Authors, as ventured at this time, to explain the *just* limits of Episcopal power, as shall be seen in the sequel.

1808, JUNE 1.

Doctor Milner publishes a Pastoral Letter against the French Clergy and Laity who refused to submit to the Pope's *Concordat with Buonaparte*, in which, he says that, *by the Concordat*, Pius VII. not only never revoked the decisions of his predecessor, concerning the Ecclesiastical affairs of France, but *expressly confirmed them!*

Abbe Blanchard writes his Defence of the emigrant Clergy against Milner, in which, he observes, that our Catholic Bishops are bound by their oath of allegiance to abjure the principle of *blind submission* to the Pope, but that, *in practice*, they contradict their professions, condemning the allegiance of the French exiled Clergy to Lewis XVIII, interfering with the *temporal* interests of France, endeavouring, by blind Censures, to put down truth, to subvert the Canons, which enjoin that no Clergyman be deposed without conviction or confession of guilt, and endeavouring to establish that very doctrine of *blind submission*, which in their oath of allegiance they *profess* to abjure! Alluding to Milner he says—" *That which you so confidently assert, is a down-right falsehood. Pius VII. has formed a phantom of a French Church on the very basis which his predecessor condemned as impious, heretical, and schismatical. Things do not alter their nature from being transferred from the hands of one Pope to*

those of another.—What Pius VII. has done, Pius VI. declared repugnant to the Canons, and above his power. “We cannot sanction these Articles, says he, because they are repugnant to the Canons,” “utpote qui Canonice Regulis adversarentur.” Briefs of April 13, 1791, and September 1, 1796.

1808, JULY 12.

I received from the Primate Dr. Reily the following Letter.

Drogheda, July 12, 1808.

I had the honour of receiving in due course, your obliging letter of the 5th instant, and also one from Mons. Caleppi the Nuncio, which you was so good as to forward to me. I suppose it is now too late to answer his Excellency, he having ere now sailed for the place of his destination. I was fully impressed with the sentiments he expresses concerning the Grenville family before I received his letter. Indeed I, in common with every Catholic in this Country, and I do suppose in the United Kingdom, look up to the head and members of that noble and most respectable family, as our best and sincerest friends, and the ablest supporters of our cause. It is true, malice and envy may endeavour to cast a shade over their merits, by attributing their manly exertions in the cause of justice, humanity, and sound policy, to selfish and ungenerous motives; but far be it from me and from my friends to be seduced for a moment by such vile misrepresentations. Had the individuals of that illustrious family been actuated by views to their own aggrandizement and personal interest, they never would have made the sacrifices which the nation knows they did make to honour, and conscience, and to truth! May the Great God reward them in this and a better world.

It is a long time since I had the pleasure of seeing you. We never met, I think, since you and I slept a night together at Belanagare, on my way from Ballagherreen, in the year

97, after executing the Commission I had received from the S. Congregation de Propaganda relative to the controversy then pending between Dr. O'Connor and the late Mr. Costelloe. Wishing you sincerely every happiness, I remain, with affectionate regard,

Dear Sir,

Your obliged and very humble Servant,

RICHARD REILLY.

1808, AUGUST 1.

The Agent for the Irish Bishops acknowledges in his Letter to a Parish Priest, that he made the *offer of a limited Veto* to Government, and he justifies that offer "*on the presumed consent of the Irish Bishops, a presumption founded on their own Resolutions of 1799, on the fact that the Sovereigns of Russia and Prussia exercise a power in this respect far exceeding that which the Irish Prelates offered in 1799, that the King enjoys it, with the consent of Rome, in Canada, that the Bishop of Quebec is not allowed so much as to chuse his Coadjutor, until the latter has been approved by the civil Governor.—I challenge any man, continues he, to shew that the allowance to Government of an exclusive power in presenting to Catholic Prelacies, if confined to three times, and accompanied, each time, with an avowal of a well-grounded suspicion of the Candidates' loyalty, contains any thing unlawful or dangerous to the Church. The Pope has allowed a direct interference and power, in the appointment of Bishops throughout the greater part of the Christian Continent, to a man who has apostatized to Mahometanism!*" *

* He adds that the S. Congregation de Propaganda had addressed a Letter to him, from which he inferred their consent to the Veto, and Sir J. Hippisley observes, that he submitted that Letter to the assembled Prelates of Ireland. Substance of his Speech, Lond. Faulder, 1810, p. 24.

1808, AUGUST 19.

Dr. Douglas, Vicar Apostolic of London, sends a Penny Post Letter of censure, suspension, and privation even of the *Sacraments of Christian Redemption*, to the Abbe Blanchard, on account of expressions derogatory from the respect due to Pope Pius VII, and *tending to schism*, which Dr. Douglas says are contained in his *Defence of the Exiled Clergy of France*.

Blanchard publishes his answer with the motto—"Nemo Episcoporum quemlibet sine certa et manifesta causa, communionem privet Ecclesiastica:" Let no Bishop deprive any man of Ecclesiastical communion, without a *certain* and *manifest* cause. Council of Meaux, an. 485, *universally received*.

He shews that the French Bishops use the same language that he uses, in their Appeal of 1803, republished in 1804,* and he opposes to Dr. Milner's plenitude of Papal power, Bossuet's celebrated *Defensio Cleri Gallicani*, in which he says ---"The ocean itself has limits to its plenitude, which if it passed, it would overwhelm the world with a deluge. The Pope's plenitude of power is limited by the Canons, which he cannot transgress."

The French Bishops object in their *Appeal exactly* as Blanchard does, "that the Pope had set himself above the Canons, though the most venerable of his predecessors had agreed in declaring null and invalid every act which even the first See might be induced to perform contrary to the venerable Canons of antiquity!---Surely none of the past ages of the Christian Church has seen any calamity to be compared with this! It is enormously prejudicial to Catholicity. The Rights of Episcopacy are annihilated, the Constitution of the Church altered, lost, destroyed. The entire state of the Church and of her

* The Vicars Apostolic knew not that the late Bishop of S. Pol de Leon was the author of the *Dissertation on the 13th Article of the Concordat*, in which Blanchard's Doctrines are maintained!

Discipline is rendered precarious, and uncertain. To justify these proceedings, the words peace and unity are trumped up, as a last resource, in default of argument, but the Gospel, says S. Hilary, knows no other peace or unity than that of J. C. which is that of truth and justice, whereas these measures tend to establish only a phantom of peace and of unity, infinitely more dangerous than open war and declared schism—it is the ruin and destruction of Christianity itself in our native Country.”

These words, it must be owned, are as strongly levelled against the Pope's Concordatum, as any used by Blanchard---consequently, in censuring Blanchard, Dr. Douglas has censured the exiled Bishops of France, and therefore that learned Priest feels himself justified in declaring those Censures *null and void*, to all intents and purposes, and he adds----“ An excommunication which would deprive Bishops, and truth, of the salutary aid, which they derive from the talents of the second order of the Clergy, would be *persecution*.”

This Pamphlet is accompanied with the *approbation of four Doctors of the Sorbonne, Grand Vicaires, and others.*

1808, SEPTEMBER 14.

The Irish Bishops assembled in Dublin Resolve “ that it is *inexpedient* to introduce any alteration of the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of Irish Bishops”---that is, *as they explain it*, in the nomination and election of said Bishops *exclusively* by themselves, and their confirmation *exclusively* by the Pope, in whatever part of the world he may be, or in whatever captivity oppressed!

Soon after this, the Primate, Dr. O'Reily, in answer to the inquiries of Lord Southwell and Sir Ed. Bellew, wrote in these words---“ *I am certain that, in forming their Resolutions, the Prelates did not mean to decide that the admission of a Veto,*

on the part of the Crown, with the consent of the Holy See, in the election of Roman Catholic Bishops, would be contrary to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, or to any practice or usage, essentially or indispensably connected with the Roman Catholic Religion. The objections raised against the negative are of a temporary nature, resulting from existing circumstances."

1808, NOVEMBER, 11.

Dr. TROY, to Dr. O'CONOR.

Dublin, 11th November, 1808.

The Resolutions of our Prelates assembled here last September respecting a Veto to the Crown, has given rise to different constructions of it, notwithstanding the term inexpedient used in the wording of it. As expediency or inexpediency must necessarily be the result of existing circumstances, and not the consequence of fixed or unalterable principles, it appears strange to me that the Resolution should be so generally conceived to reject the Veto as inadmissible, and to preclude any future discussion about it. Neither I nor many other Prelates adopted it in this sense, nor does grammar sanction it. The fact is, that, as we were not called upon by Ministers to consider the measure, we thought it inexpedient to allow any alteration in our Discipline under the present Ministry of the State, avowedly hostile to Catholic claims, and who would not acquiesce in them, if we renounced even articles of faith, whilst we retain that of the Pope's Supremacy.

The popular feeling here is, I must own, decidedly against the admissibility of a Veto in the Crown, which our Nobility and landed Gentry, are desirous to grant. The Bishops supposed friendly to it are libelled in the public prints, and those who signed Resolutions in favour of it in 1799, are

charged with inconsistency, by adopting the late Resolutions. Very unjustly indeed, as the circumstances of the two periods are widely different. In the former we were called upon, pending the Union Question, by an Administration supposed friendly, and holding out the prospect, if not an implied promise, to consider the measure, as the condition of emancipation. At present our hopes have not only been blasted, but a No-Popery administration declares in both Houses of Parliament that we are to expect nothing more."

(From the original.)

The Vicar of Castabala writes to an obscure man, a *Mr. Coyne*, that he would *spill the last drop of his blood*, before he would concede to *any interference* of a Non-Catholic Prince in the nomination of a Catholic Bishop. *

1809.

The Vicar of Castabala publishes a *libel*, intitled a Supplement to a *Pastoral Letter*, in which he does not blush to declare, that he went to the *Treasury*, and to the *Alien Office*, to *inform* against his antagonist Blanchard, on account of *personal affronts, offered to himself!*

"Blanchard, (says he, p. 46,) a quibbling calumniator, *invalidates his Majesty's right to the throne of England!*—The experience of his own intimate friends, ought to have taught him, that the right of *habeas corpus*, and *trial by jury*, are a dead letter in his regard, by virtue of the Alien Act."

"I went to the Treasury last Winter, and had the honour of a conference with one of the Lords of it, an intimate friend of the Minister. (Heavens! who will dare, after this, to write

* He had himself proposed, that the *Veto* should extend as far as to controul the election of *seven Candidates*, and now he raises a cry of heresy against *Columbanus*, who does not go half so far!

against the great man of Castabala?) I then *exhibited to that honourable Personage, the different libels* published against me by Blanchard, and offered myself to be taken into custody, if I were deemed guilty. This personage was pleased, *in return*, to bear *honourable* testimony to my character, and to declare that I may punish Blanchard and his associates *most severely*, if I will. But prevention and not punishment being my object, I *went next to the Alien Office*, and again exhibited the Pamphlets and papers. The libellous nature of them was there acknowledged, and a promise of *reprimanding* Blanchard and his champion was given to me."

Upon this I shall make no comment.---I leave the fact, as I find it in his own words, to that manly indignation which virtue feels, and that religious horror which genuine Catholicity inspires. *Is this a Catholic Bishop?*

1809, MAY 12.

Dr. Moylan writes to a person of high rank, and to Sir J. Hippisley, proposing on the part of the Bishops "*a Concordatum, by which the Sovereign Pontiff will engage that no person shall be named to any Roman Catholic vacant See in this Country, but such as shall be elected and presented by the Roman Catholic Bishops of this Kingdom, who shall enter into the most solemn engagements that can be reasonably required, that they will not elect or present any person to vacant Sees, but such as they conscientiously believe to be loyal,*" &c. See pages 138, 190, 207, and 209, of these sheets.

SYNOD OF TULLOW.

1809, JUNE 6.

At a Synod of Irish Bishops, assembled at Tullow, the following Resolution was agreed to, *nem. con.*---"*Thirdly, that*

in the Pontifical Acts of Pius VII, already mentioned, (namely, his Bulls "Qui Christi vices," and "Ecclesia Christi," and the Concordat,) he has validly, and agreeably to the spirit of the Canons, exerted the powers belonging to the Apostolic See; and we accept, approve, and concur with the said Acts of Pius VII." See page 4 of these sheets.

This Resolution was approved and subscribed by all the Irish Bishops, on the 3d of July, and 21st of August, of the same year, in the following words—

"Adhering to the dogmatical decisions of Pius VI, against the Civil Constitution of the French Clergy, (which is however established by the Concordat of Pius VII,) and judging, after these decisions, that the said Constitution is *impious, heretical, schismatical*, and on the whole to be rejected, we judge, at the same time, that our Holy Father Pius VII. has not meant to approve (by his Concordat) of those infamous principles, but that he has adhered to that which was dogmatical in the said decisions of his predecessor, and has only yielded what the dreadful exigencies of the times demanded; and that in his said Pontifical Acts, for the restoration of Catholic unity, he has *validly*, and agreeably to the spirit of the sacred Canons, exerted the powers belonging to the Apostolic See, and we accept, approve, and concur with the said Acts of Pius VII, (one of which is *Buonaparte's Coronation*,) as good, rightful, authentic, necessary, and done in the faith of his predecessor!"

REMARKS.

If, as those Bishops state, the Civil Constitution is *heretical* and *impious*, the French Concordat Clergy, who have sworn to maintain it, are impious and heretical, and cannot be re-united to the Catholic Church without a solemn retractation; unless it be pretended that the Pope can, by plenitude of power,

consecrate heresy and impiety.* Now it has never yet appeared that any such public retractation has been made.

The Irish Bishops indeed appeal to the dreadful exigency of the times, which compelled Pius VII. to approve of what his predecessor condemned; but Pius VI. not only condemned the Civil Constitution, and deposition of the French Clergy as *impious*, he also condemned this plea of *exigency* of times! He charges the Cardinal de Lomime with *prevarication* for alleging that excuse, and says that no exigency can render *just* that which is intrinsically and essentially unjust. I leave the Bishops to get over this difficulty as well as they can. The Gospel points out only two ways to escape persecution, *flight* or *death*. But the Synod of Tullow has discovered a third, *to yield to circumstances*, and they allow an indefinite extent to this doctrine, leaving it entirely to the supreme will of the Pope, an individual like other men, liable to error, to seduction, intimidation, the secret intrigues of Cabinets, the influence of ambition, the imbecility of old age!

Again, the French emigrant Bishops, the best acquainted with the affairs of their own native Churches, declare that Pius VIIth's Acts are *null and void*; but the Tullow Gentlemen declare them *holy* and *valid*. The former find no expressions strong enough to condemn them, the latter are evidently at a loss for expressions of extravagant praise!

The fact is, that their great object is to render themselves *absolute*, at the expence of the most venerable Laws of the Christian Church!

We have lived to see the day when Pius VII, despoiled of his own States, by the very man in whose favour he acquiesced in these Acts of spoliation, put in his claim for his own titles,

* The Dispensing power which some Irish Bishops allow to the Pope, extended so far as to permit the *late Bishop of Cashel* to receive the Sacrament *without recantation*! See the trial of Father Gahan published and republished by Dr. Troy!

on those very principles which he condemned in the French Emigrants; and we have also seen those Irish Bishops, who condemned the exiled Bishops of France, and declared them deposed, resolve, on the 26th of February, 1810---“That no Bishop, and much less the Pope, can be deposed, except by voluntary resignation, or a canonical sentence!”---Such is the inconsistency of error! Such the conduct of men who are governed by *exigency of times!*

1809, JUNE 10.

The Pope, deprived of all his temporal dominions, by the very man in whose favour he had declared all Frenchmen absolved from their oaths of allegiance to the Bourbons, issues a *Protest* against Buonaparte, in which he declares himself comforted by the reflection, that he encounters this heavy misfortune, of privation of temporal power, *not for any intrigue of worldly policy*, but from an unwillingness to betray his duty to the Usurper.

He concludes by issuing an *excommunication* against *his dear son in J. C. Buonaparte!*

1809, NOVEMBER 29.

The Bishops of Connacht appeal to the Pope against the interference of Doctors Troy and Reily, in the Ecclesiastical affairs of that Province, and particularly in supporting the last will of Dr. Dillon, Archbishop of Tuam, who bequeathed his Diocese, without consulting them, to the Rev. *Oliver Kelly*.

This Appeal is signed by---

DOMINICUS, *Aladensis*---Senior Bishop of the Province.

THOMAS, *Clonfertensis*.

EDMUNDUS, *Elphinensis*.

NICOLAUS, *Duacensis*.

JOANNES, *Accadensis*;

And by the Warden of Galway.

In this Appeal they state that Dr. Dillon was totally unqualified to fill his station during the four last years of his life,

having had an apoplectic fit, five years before he died, that he was a man of intemperate manners, that *Oliver Kelly*, a man of obscure birth, availed himself of the imbecility of this old *Dotard*, to have himself appointed his successor, at a time when old *Dillon* was not able to form any rational opinion on the subject. The words are remarkable.--

“Age nunc---Beatissime Pater---vix e vivis, sub die 30 Augusti proxime elapsi, ereptus fuit Archipræsul noster Tuamens. *Edwardus Dillon*, hujusce Vestrae Provinciae Metropolitæ, cui muneri officioque ad implendo, ab annis saltem quatuor, omni modo impar fuit, fatentibus omnibus, utpote qui morbo Apoplectico, quinque circiter annis antea percussus fuit, quem morbum et celare, et ignorari, in deliciis semper habuit, præterquam quod irrequietæ semper fuit, et præcipitis indolis Præsul in rebus ferme omnibus, cum ecce illico post obitum ejus, Pax et tranquillitas istius Archidiaeceseos evanescere visa fuerit, quæ jamdudum vulnerata crudeliter fuerat variis inauditisque modis, &c. Hisce malis ansam præbuit, præ cæteris Sacerdos *Oliverius Kelly*, Canonicus Ecclesiæ Tuamensis, qui neque nobilitate originis gaudet, neque unquam Sacrae Theologiæ Professor Salmanticensis, uti, tam perfrecta fronte, *falso* asserere ausi sunt octo Canonici fautores, in sua ad Sacram Congregationem de Propaganda fide Postulatione, sed, e contra, ex pauperibus ortus Parentibus, insimulque juvenis ambitiosus nimisi, qui ex deservitore sive Capellano Parochiæ Tuamensis, statim factus Vicarius Generalis, et Canonicus, et Pastor, mirum quam benevolum sibi fecerit defunctum Archiepiscopum, ipsius animum sibi adjunxerit, *eundemque quodammodo circumvenerit, multa sua usus arte, adulatione, blandimentis, et adsentationibus* in omni quacumque re et casu, adeo ut *in Oliverii dominatu* totus fuerit, et quasi alter evaserit Archiepiscopus.”

1810, FEBRUARY 22.

Earl Grey presented a Petition from the Catholics of England, expressing their willingness to consent to *any ar-*

rangement that might be deemed necessary for the security of the existing establishments, which might not be inconsistent with their own religious opinions.

1810, FEBRUARY 26.

The Irish Bishops, assembled in Synod in Dublin, confirm all their Resolutions of September 14, 1809! They Resolve that “the Pope’s imprisonment is not a Deposition, because *no Bishop may rightfully be put down from his rank, unless by voluntary resignation or canonical judgment*, and that during the public captivity of his said Holiness, and until his freedom shall have been unequivocally manifested by some Act, not merely of *approbation or cession*, we refuse, send back, and reprobate, and moreover, for ourselves, we annul and cancel, as to any effect, all Briefs, or pretended Briefs, Bulls, or pretended Bulls, Rescripts, *even as of his proper motion*, and certain knowledge, bearing title as from his said Holiness, and purporting to be declaratory of his free, or of *any resignation of the Papal office*; and if his said Holiness should die as now, a prisoner, we will continue to account the Holy See vacant, until full information, and canonical proof shall be had by us of the free, canonical, and due election of his successor.”

RESOLUTION 12.

“Resolved, that before the date of an Irish Act of Parliament, giving the last relief to his Majesty’s Roman Catholic Subjects, and from that to this present time, the *recommendation* of us Bishops, when concurring, had been *progressively advancing in weight and authority with the Holy See*.”

RESOLUTION 13.

“Resolved, that *by the course lately adhered to*, two benefits were obtained, and *were in progress to become a part of our Ecclesiastical system*; the one that the choice of persons to fill the office of Bishops *effectively, originated from*, and was

circumscribed by us, so far at least as to make it inaccessible (except by our permission) to any foreign temporal influence, or corrupt recommendation."

RESOLUTION 14.

"Resolved, that any change at present, in our Ecclesiastical appointments, expressly innovating on our religious discipline, on the ground of its being perilous to the State, must degrade our Church in *the estimation of Europe.*"

RESOLUTION 15.

"Resolved, that the idea of making the elections of Bishops entirely *national*, by confining said election to Chapters alone, or to Chapters and Metropolitans, is superseded by the matters and considerations of the three last Resolutions, is moreover *not within our competence*, and though it had *been free of the charge of Schism*, would, in the present circumstances of the Irish Catholics, subject our Religion to the most serious and unseemly disadvantages, and, in our judgment, would most probably lapse into the sole and positive appointment of the Crown."

RESOLUTION 16.

"Resolved, that we seek for nothing beyond the *mere integrity* and safety of the Roman Catholic Religion, in its Christian *faith and communion*, and in its *essential* discipline, subordination, and moral code!"

REMARKS ON THESE RESOLUTIONS

OF

FEBRUARY 26, 1810.

It is an old observation, that no two things can more widely differ than *craft* and *wisdom*.—Wisdom proceeds on steady principles of an elevated morality, to which, in all changes of

times and circumstances, it invariably adheres; whereas the views of craft are limited by actual emergency! Where immediate interest may be advanced by a cunning falsehood, it will avail itself of that course of policy, without considering that falsehood, though it may prosper for a season, will be detected in the end.—In 1808, the Irish Bishops objected to a negative only as *inexpedient*, they declared their objection to be only of a *temporary nature*.* Their accredited Agent had waited, with Lord Fingal, on Mr. Ponsonby, to propose it on the part of Ireland; and *on the faith of the nation*, it was so proposed in both Houses of Parliament!† How comes it

* Compare Dr. O'Reily's and Troy's Letters, above, p. 203. Why did they not allege this *incompetence* then, instead of *inexpedience*?

† Mr. Ponsonby's Speech, May 25, 1810. The Vicar of Castabala's Letter to Mr. Ponsonby was read in the House.—“Dr. Milner takes the liberty of stating *distinctly, in writing*, the substance of what he did say, or meant to say, in the conversation which he had the honour of holding with Mr. Ponsonby. First, the Catholic Prelates of Ireland are willing to give a *direct negative* power to his Majesty's Government, with respect to the nomination to their Titular Bishoprics, in such manner that when they have, *among themselves*, resolved who is the fittest person to fill the vacant See, they will transmit his name to his Majesty's Ministers, and if the latter should object to that name, they will transmit *another*, and another, until a name is presented to which no objection is made.”

Mr. Ryder observes in his Speech, May 25, 1810. The House cannot forget, that when this question was brought forward two years ago, it was recommended to the attention of Parliament, upon the *express and specific grounds* of a proposal to allow the Crown a negative. Mr. Ponsonby, being asked on what authority he made that assertion, stated it to be on the authority of Dr. Milner, a Roman Catholic Bishop, and the *accredited Agent of the Irish Roman Catholic Clergy in this Country*, who spoke in the name, and by the authority of the Roman Catholics. What followed? Not many months after, September 14, 1808, the Roman Catholic Bishops held a meeting in Ireland, and Resolved to deny to the Crown all interference, direct or indirect, in the choice of Roman Catholic Bishops, and, in one of Dr. Milner's publications he *expressly denied* that he ever gave that authority, adding, that he would rather *shed the last drop of his blood*, than consent that any *Non-Catholic Prince* should

that, in 1810, they declared that negative to be schismatical, subversive of the Catholic Religion, and utterly *beyond their competency*, which, ever since the year 1799, they themselves had repeatedly proposed?—Who will unravel this mystery? Who will put that construction on it which alone can unfold the windings of the human heart?

It will be found that, in every Proposal made by the Irish Bishops, there is uniformly a reservation of great, extensive, and *exclusive* power, in favour of themselves. They reserve to themselves the power of *election* to vacant Sees; depriving the second order of all their ancient privileges of Dean and Chapter, and expressly stipulating that they shall have the power to elect, not those only whom the Dean and Chapter may recommend, but *any other person they may think proper*.

It is also well known that, by a private stipulation, agreed to by the four Archbishops amongst themselves, it was settled, that whenever any Archbishop named his own successor, the other three should concur in that nomination. Thus, when the late Dr. Dillon of Tuam died, he named his favourite *Oliver Kelly*, without consulting with his Suffragan Bishops, without holding any Synod, without even the *form* of any election, and against the wish and the privileges not only of

have the power of interposing, *in any manner*, in the election of their Bishops, that is, rather than consent to a proposal made in his name, by *his authority*, in *his hearing*, both in this and the other House of Parliament, and for which, while the impression was fresh in his recollection, he made, as Lord Grenville has informed the public in his Pamphlet, *the most gratifying acknowledgments!*

It is remarkable, says Mr. Ponsonby, that, though Dr. Milner had said that the Newspaper reports of what fell from me, went sather than what I had stated, yet I received two Letters, thanking me for what I was supposed to have said on the subject, one from an Irish Archbishop, the other from a Bishop, both acknowledging that there was nothing offensive in what I did advance, but that, on the contrary, it was perfectly *correct*, and consistent with the sentiments of the Catholics themselves!

the senior Bishop, but of all the Bishops of that Province. Those Bishops remonstrated against that proceeding as uncannonical; but it appears from a Letter of Dr. Moylan's, dated Cork, January 19, 1810, that they were overruled by the concurring consent of the three surviving Archbishops, to support the late *Dr. Dillon's* legacy of his Diocese in favour of Oliver Kelly! *

As long as there was any hope of obtaining these darling objects of power, the negative was declared to be only *inexpedient for the present!*—a door was left open for further discussion, hopes were entertained, from future contingencies,

* "The death of Dr. Dillon has occasioned much bickering in the Province of Connacht. The Prelates opposed the nomination of the Rev. Dr. Kelly. Some of them expected to be raised to the Archiepiscopal See, but they were disappointed, as *Dr. Dillon had postulated for Dr. Kelly to be his Coadjutor*, last July, and was joined in the postulation by the three other Archbishops."

Extract of a Letter on this species of nomination, dated Febr. 22, 1810.

Last week our Committee met on the Veto, but they adjourned, in consequence of an intimation from Dr. Troy, that the Clergy were to meet in Synod on the 21st. They will perhaps propose that the four Archbishops shall make our future Bishops. I think their arrogance equal to such a proposal; but I should, without hesitation, *prefer a Veto*, to vesting them with such a prerogative. *They have too much power already.* Such a power would convert the Episcopal Bench into an office for canvassing, intrigue, patronage, insincerity, calumny, and lay the whole Irish Church prostrate at their feet. In short, it would be sending the buyers and sellers into the Temple! Had not Dillon wished to name his successor, by calling for a Coadjutor, and had not that intrigue been seconded by the three surviving Archbishops, the schism in Tuam would not have occurred, and the scandal which has ensued would not have defiled the character of the Irish Church. The Archbishops have espoused the cause of Kelly, who is only thirty-six years of age, against all the Bishops of the Province! Just so Dr. Murray has been appointed to Dublin by Dr. Troy, without consulting the Dublin Clergy, and a silent revolution has, by stolen marches, been forced upon the Irish Church.

and concessions, which might flow from the weakness, and the embarrassments of the State!

In 1810, after Lord Grenville published his Letter to Lord Fingal, when the views of that Statesman were found to be hostile to the additional *unlimited* power, which was evidently the aim of the Bishops—then that *negative*, which before was only *inexpedient*, became absolutely *impracticable, impossible, schismatical*, as by their Resolutions of 1810. Why then amuse Government with *possibilities* of arrangement? Why, instead of declaring the Veto *inexpedient*, and that its refusal was only *temporary*, why did they not declare, in 1809, as in 1810, that it would be schismatical? Why hold out to their Parliamentary friends a prospect of arrangement, whilst they knew that no discussion could be of any avail?

The truth is, that to obtain *absolute* dominion over the Irish Church, they had two strings to their bow, one for the Pope, and one for the King.—*Scratch us and we will scratch you.*—“ Provided we are allowed by both, said they, to have the *exclusive* power of *electing Bishops*, naming our own successors, deposing and censuring the second order of the Clergy *at will*, and confining the whole power of the Irish Church *exclusively* to ourselves, we shall yield up the independence of the Hierarchy, in the first instance, to the Pope’s *plenitude of power*, by which he may depose all the Bishops of any National Church, as he did those of France, and we shall allow the King a *Veto*, subject to that power of the Pope. But if, in the course of negotiation, we discover that this arbitrary power be not acceded to by Government, we shall confine the *unqualified and arbitrary* nomination to the Pope, who will grant us the *preference of recommendation*, with an overbearing influence and censuring power, which neither the Irish Clergy nor Laity, unaided by Government, ever will be able to resist.

In fact, the censuring power, as it is now uncanonically exercised, is sufficient to turn the whole scale of the Irish

Priesthood, and consequently the mass of Irish population, in favour of any measure that may be dictated by Papal power. There is no adequate tie that counterbalances this powerful engine of human policy, by connecting the second order of the Catholic Clergy with the State.

I am far from meaning that the Pope's power should be limited in Ireland, otherwise than it was in France. But it is obvious that the Catholics *themselves* stand in need of such safeguards, against the abuse of Papal and Episcopal power, as other Catholic States found *wise* and *necessary*. If these canonical securities were once legalized, I am confident that the State neither would, nor could, insist on any thing more. But surely experience shews, that as long as spiritual authority is exercised by men, it will work its way into temporal concerns; that a taste for power is inseparable from human nature, and that the artifices which, under various pretexts of piety and conscience, it uses for the attainment of its objects, ought not to escape the sagacity of Legislation!

The Catholic Church of Ireland is as Papistical as if she were placed nearer the Gallies of *Civita Vecchia*; she has not only never vindicated her liberties, as the Gallican Church has, against the encroachments of the Roman Court, but her Bishops have ever assailed those Irish Clergy who made the experiment of resistance, with the most relentless persecution; and they have thus evinced to all the world, that such a revolution in our affairs, as that of the *Pragmatic Sanction* of S. Lewis in favour of France, can never be effected in Ireland, without the *interference of the State*.

Sir J. Hipplesey observed on the 10th Resolution of the Irish Bishops, February 26, 1810, that it was falsely represented as a rejection of all Bulls and Rescripts of Pius VII. during his captivity.---In fact, it is confined only to such as import *resignation of the Papal office*. Now why have the Bishops confined the invalidity of the Pope's Acts, during his captivity,

to his *resignation* alone? If any Pontifical Act of his is invalid, *because he is not free*, does not the same cause produce the same effect with regard to nomination of Bishops! Or where are the lines *within* which all is invalid, and *without* which all is tainted by compulsion? The intelligent reader will observe, that here the Bishops have left for *themselves* a latitude, in which they may expatiate at leisure, confining or extending the boundaries of obedience, as best suits their interests, or as best calculated to promote their designs! In a Synod assembled in Dublin, on the 24th of February, 1810, all the Irish Bishops Resolved, first—"That it is the undoubted and *exclusive* right of Roman Catholic Bishops, to discuss *all matters* appertaining to the *doctrines and discipline* of the Roman Catholic Church."

Thus the intrigues of the Maynooth *Vatican* finally resolve themselves into an *avowed* despotic *Imperium in Imperio*, over their *Clergy* and Laity, which it was their object all along to establish by the aid of Government, and which, when they saw that they could not obtain it, they resolved finally, by the aid of Ecclesiastical Censures, to establish beyond the controul and authority of the State!

1811, SEPTEMBER 20.

Dr. TROY'S CIRCULAR TO THE BISHOPS.

Most Honoured Lord,

Many of our Prelates and Clergy, having expressed an anxious wish, that the erroneous statements and fallacious arguments of Columbanus ad Hibernos, should be refuted and exposed to the Public, I have prevailed on Counsellor Clinch to undertake the meritorious task. I have not seen his Manuscript, but am assured by competent Judges, it contains a masterly refutation of the sophisms with which the four published Letters of Columbanus are replete; and vindicates

the Holy See, and our Hierarchy, from the calumnies, which he has so wantonly heaped on both. The work is in forwardness, and will go to Press when I can ascertain the number of Copies each Prelate will take for himself and his Clergy. Your Lordship will therefore have the goodness to let me know how many of them Mr. Coyne [the Printer] is to send to you. To expedite the publication, I shall advance to him the sum necessary for paper and printing.

*I have the honour to be, with the greatest respect,
Most honoured Lord,
Your Lordship's faithful and humble servant in Christ,*

J. T. TROY.

1812.

Dr. Milner publishes Pastoral Instructions for Lent, in which he says—"A Synod was held in London, Feb. 24, 1810, where the four Vicars Apostolic decree that those Priests are to be forbidden to exercise any Ecclesiastical function, and to say Mass, who refuse to acknowledge that Pope Pius VII is neither a heretic nor schismatic, nor the author or abettor of heresy or schism."

How can we know this but by inspiration? By our oath of allegiance we renounce the Pope's infallibility.



FINIS.

